THE XXXIX ARTICLES

E. Derrell Green

2.24.'97.

Library of the Theological Seminary,

PRINCETON, N. J.

Purchased by the
Mrs. Robert Lenox Kennedy Church History Fund.

BX 5137 .G740 1896
Green, E. Tyrrell b. 1864.
The thirty-nine articles an
the age of the Reformation

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2015

https://archive.org/details/thirtyninearticl00gree

The Thirty-nine Articles

The Thirty-nine Articles and The Age of the Reformation

An Historical and Doctrinal Exposition in the Light of Contemporary Documents

By

The Rev. E. Tyrrell Green, M.A.

Lecturer in Theology and Hebrew, S. David's College, Lampeter
Sometime Scholar of S. John's College, Oxford

London
Wells Gardner, Darton & Co.
3, Paternoster Buildings, E.C.

1896

MATRI MEÆ

CARISSIMÆ COMPLORATÆ

NON TAMEN SINE SPE

CERTA ET INDUBITATA

RESURRECTIONIS AD VITAM ÆTERNAM.

"STANTES ERANT PEDES NOSTRI

IN ATRIIS TUIS

IERUSALEM."

PREFACE

During the past few years it has been one of the writer's duties to lecture upon the XXXIX. Articles at S. David's College, Lampeter. Of the several extant treatises on the subject no one commended itself to him as a basis for a series of lectures;[1] he therefore set out upon a course of study, guided principally by the conviction that the position taken up by the English Church at the Reformation can only be really appreciated after a careful comparison of the XXXIX. Articles with other Formularies or Confessions of Faith issued in various parts of Christendom during the sixteenth century. In lecturing to students great care was taken to present, under the various heads of doctrine and practice, the agreement or difference between statements in our English Articles and the wording of (*a*) the Decrees of the Council of Trent, representing the position of the Church of Rome; (*b*) Formularies exhibiting the theology of the Lutheran or Protestant Reformers; and (*c*) Confessions, or Symbolic writings, embodying the teaching of the Swiss or Reformed Theologians.

The present volume is based upon the lectures delivered at Lampeter, and its plan was first sketched out in 1892. It is intended to supply a clear analysis of the contents of the XXXIX. Articles, with a short exposition, and it has been the writer's aim to indicate exactly how far the wording of our Articles is traceable to foreign sources. Special attention has also been drawn to the elucidation or illustration which the Articles receive not only from Continental Confessions of Faith, but also from writings of English Reformers, such as the "Homilies" and the "Reformatio Legum," besides letters of individual divines. In addition to its usefulness as an exposi-

[1] The need of a new manual of the XXXIX. Articles seems to be generally felt. While the sheets of this book were passing through the press two volumes appeared on the same subject—(1) "An Introduction to the Articles of the Church of England," by Dr. Maclear and the Rev. W. W. Williams (*Macmillan*); (2) "The Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England Explained, with an Introduction," by the Rev. E. C. S. Gibson, vol. i. (*Methuen*).

tion of the XXXIX. Articles, it is hoped that the volume may prove acceptable to Theological students as a handbook of the Symbolic Theology of the sixteenth century, and as forming a convenient summary, with extracts from original authorities, of the important religious controversies of the Age of the Reformation. Two features may be mentioned which should render the work especially useful to young students and to such as have but small libraries—(1) Bare references to other books have been avoided, all passages quoted in illustration being cited in full; (2) English translations of all Latin or Greek quotations have been added in an Appendix.

In such a work as the present it has been found impossible to acknowledge indebtedness to other writers in detail, but a list has been added of the principal books consulted in its preparation. The writer wishes in particular to acknowledge his obligation to notes of Lectures by the Rev. W. W. Jackson (Rector of Exeter College, Oxford), upon which the Introductory matter is partly based. He would also express his warmest thanks to two kind friends and colleagues at Lampeter; the Rev. Chancellor Davey (Vice-Principal of S. David's College), who has read the sheets of the book as it passed through the press, offering many valuable suggestions, and the Rev. G. Woosung Wade (Professor of Latin), who has carefully revised the translations given in Appendix VII.

S. David's College, Lampeter,
May 1896.

LIST OF BOOKS CONSULTED IN THE PREPARATION OF THIS VOLUME

A.

BOOKS UPON THE XXXIX. ARTICLES IN PARTICULAR.

Allnatt (M. E. S.). The Settled Doctrine of our Church. *Nisbet.* 1884.

Baker (Dr. W.). Plain Exposition of the XXXIX. Articles. *Rivingtons.* 1893.

Beveridge (Bp.). Discourse upon the XXXIX. Articles. *Oxford.* 1840.

Bickersteth (Dean). Questions Illustrating the XXXIX. Articles. *Rivingtons.* 1877.

Boucher (J. S.). Lecture Notes on the Sacramental Articles. *Mowbray.*

Boultbee (T. P.). Commentary on the XXXIX. Articles. *Longmans.*

Browne (Bp. Harold). Exposition of the XXXIX. Articles. *Longmans.* 1878.

Burnet (Bp.). Exposition of the XXXIX. Articles. *Oxford.* 1831.

Cloquet (R. L.). Exposition of the XXXIX. Articles. *Nisbet.* 1885.

Davey (W. H.). The Several Editions of the Articles of the Church of England. *Parker.* 1861.

Forbes (Bp.). Explanation of the XXXIX. Articles. *Parker.* 1878.

Hardwick (Archdn.). History of the Articles of Religion. *Bell.* 1881.

J. W. Catechism of the XXXIX. Articles. *Griffith & Farran.* 1877.

Ketchley (H. E.). Questions and Answers on the XXXIX. Articles. *Hall.* 1893.

Lamb (Dr. J.). Historical Account of the XXXIX. Articles. *Cambridge.* 1829.

Laurence (Abp.). Bampton Lectures. *Parker.* 1838.

Lightfoot (Dr. J.). Text-Book of the XXXIX. Articles. *Sonnenschein.* 1890.

Newman (J. H.). Tract XC. in "Tracts for the Times."

Norris (Archdn.). On XXXIX. Articles in "Manuals of Religious Instruction." *Rivingtons.*

Sancta Clara. The Articles of the Anglican Church. *Hayes.* 1865. (Reprinted from ed. of 1646.)

Welchman (Archdn.). The XXXIX. Articles. *S.P.C.K.*

CONTENTS

PAGE

INTRODUCTORY 1

A SHORT SKETCH OF FORMULARIES, ETC., ISSUED DURING THE COURSE OF THE ENGLISH REFORMATION 5

ANALYSIS OF THE XXXIX. ARTICLES 18

HIS MAJESTY'S DECLARATION 21

TEXT OF THE XXXIX. ARTICLES, WITH NOTES 23

APPENDIX I.—

TABLE OF CONFESSIONS OF FAITH, ETC. 324

APPENDIX II.—

A COMPARISON OF THE BISHOPS' BOOK AND KING'S BOOK . 336

APPENDIX III.—

EXTRACTS SHOWING THE CHANGE IN CRANMER'S OPINIONS . 341

APPENDIX IV.—

TEXT OF ARTICLES I.–XV. AS REVISED BY THE WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY 343

APPENDIX V.—

TEXT OF BISHOP GESTE'S LETTER ON ARTICLE XXVIII. . . 349

APPENDIX VI.— PAGE

TEXT OF THE IRISH ARTICLES OF 1615 351

APPENDIX VII.—

TRANSLATION OF PASSAGES QUOTED FROM DOCUMENTS . . 371

INDEX 438

THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES

I

INTRODUCTORY

"*With the heart man believeth unto righteousness,*
And with the mouth confession is made unto salvation."—ROM. x. 10.

WHEREVER there is true belief in the heart, there will also be the outward expression of that belief, both in word and deed. Hence it is that we find very early traces of short summaries of Christian belief or Creeds.[1] Then in course of time were accepted the three Creeds, which, our Church says, "ought thoroughly to be received and believed" (Art. VIII.). Until the Reformation the three Creeds were the only authoritative statements of doctrine. In the Church of Rome there was no written authority of doctrine, other than the Creeds, until the decrees of the Council of Trent (1564). The decrees of Councils may, from time to time, have added to received doctrines, *e.g.*, Transubstantiation was defined at the fourth Lateran Council (1215), but the process by which conflicting beliefs contended until one prevailed went constantly on until the Council of Trent.

The sixteenth century was marked by a general upheaval and unsettlement in religious matters, a state of things owing partly to the revival of learning, which had caused men to contrast the Church of the New Testament with mediæval Rome and to think for themselves, and partly due to ecclesiastical abuses. At this crisis, especially in those countries where a breach with Rome had taken place, a definition of doctrine became necessary. It had to be made clear how far the Church was at one with the

[1] See notes on Article VIII.

Church of the past, how it differed from the Church of Rome on the one hand, and from other Reformed bodies on the other hand. Thus at the period of the Reformation we find the various parts of Christendom putting forth more or less complete confessions of faith.[1]

Speaking quite generally, there is this broad distinction between our English Articles and the formularies of foreign Protestant bodies. The latter contain a more uniform body of doctrine than the Articles of the English Church, because they owe more to individuals and less to the force of national feeling and the various influences at work in the nation. As might be expected from this fact, our Articles are not systematic, they do not evolve a logically complete theory of God's dealings with man. Lutheranism is a system gathered round the doctrine of justifying faith, other doctrines having a place as they bear upon it. Calvinism, again, is a system turning on election and reprobation, other doctrines being subordinated to or influenced by these. But the position taken up by the English Church in the Articles is the reformation of abuses, the organic identity of the Church before and after the Reformation is assumed, the old creed is assumed, and abuses are corrected.

One sometimes hears the Articles spoken of as "containing a whole body of divinity." From what has been already said it will be seen that this is scarcely the case.[2] What the Church of England does claim is that they are a fair Scriptural account

[1] See Appendix I.

[2] The titles of the various English formularies indicate that it was not at any time the intention of the English Reformers to draw up a complete confession of faith.

The X. ARTICLES (1536) are entitled:—

> "Articles devised by the Kinges Highnes Majestie to stablyshe Christen quietnes and unitie amonge us, and to avoyde contentious opinions, which articles be also approved by the consent and determination of the hole clergie of this Realme. Anno MDXXXVI."

The XLII. ARTICLES (1553)—

> "Articles agreed on by the Bishoppes and other learned menne in the Synode at London, in the yere of our Lorde Godde MDLII., for the auoiding of controuersie in opinions, and the establishement of a godlie concorde in certeine matiers of Religion."

The XXXIX. ARTICLES (1571)—

> "Articles whereupon it was agreed by the Archbishoppes and Bishoppes of both prouinces and the whole cleargie in the Convocation holden in London in the yere of our Lord God 1562, according to the computation of the Churche of Englande, for the auoiding of the diuersities of opinions, and for the stablishyng of consent touching true religion."

of the leading doctrines of Christianity, set out in a way specially suited to the needs of the time when they were composed, together with a condemnation of prevalent errors, both of the Roman Church and of Protestants. Many subjects are unnoticed in them,[1] but as far as the Articles go, they are the legal definition of the doctrines of our Church, though it is to the Prayer-Book, together with the Articles, that English Churchmen look for the genuine expression of their Church's faith.

It is often stated that the XXXIX. Articles are a sort of compromise, drawn up with the view of reconciling contending parties; but surely the great object of the compilers was to set forth the true doctrine of the Church of England. The theory that the Articles are designedly ambiguous derives no support from the Articles themselves, and directly contradicts the avowed purpose of the compilers as expressed in the title. It is also abundantly clear that Cranmer, who had the chief hand in the composition of our Articles, altogether disapproved of such a dangerous and unprincipled line of conduct; *cf.* the Archbishop's letter to John a Lasco (dated London, July 4, 1548), in which he says: "We are desirous of setting forth in our churches the true doctrine of God, *and have no wish to adapt it to all tastes and to trifle with ambiguities*, but, laying aside all carnal and prudential motives, to transmit to posterity a true and explicit form of doctrine agreeable to the rule of the sacred writings."[2]

The clergy are required at their ordination to subscribe the Articles, in accordance with Canon XXXVI.

> "No person shall hereafter be received into the ministry, nor, either by institution or collation, admitted to any Ecclesiastical living, nor suffered to preach, to catechize, or to be a Lecturer, or Reader of Divinity, in either University, or in any Cathedral, or Collegiate Church, City, or Market-town, Parish Church, Chapel, or in any other place within this realm, except he be licensed,

[1] The following important subjects are not treated in the XXXIX. Articles:—
(1.) The work of the Son of God in Creation.
(2.) The work of the Holy Spirit in nature.
(3.) The intercession of the ascended Christ.
(4.) The nature and office of the Holy Angels.
(5.) The resurrection of men in general, the everlasting life of the righteous and everlasting punishment of the wicked.
(6.) We may also add that the devil is only once mentioned (in Art. XVII.) as thrusting men to desperation or to unclean living.

[2] Original Letters, vol. i. p. 17.

either by the Archbishop, or by the Bishop of the diocese where he is to be placed, under their hands and seals, or by one of the two Universities under their seal likewise; and except he shall first make and subscribe the following declaration, which, for the avoiding of all ambiguities, he shall subscribe in this order and form of words, setting down both his Christian and surname, viz. :—

I, A. B., do solemnly make the following declaration: I assent to the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, and to the Book of Common Prayer, and of Ordering of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons; I believe the doctrine of the [united] Church of England [and Ireland] as therein set forth, to be agreeable to the Word of God; and in public prayer and administration of the Sacraments, I will use the form in the said book prescribed, and none other, except so far as shall be ordered by lawful authority."

In former years subscription to the Articles was also required from all who graduated at the Universities.

II

A SHORT SKETCH OF FORMULARIES, &c., ISSUED DURING THE COURSE OF THE ENGLISH REFORMATION

1533. In repudiating the Papal Supremacy it was maintained (25 Hen. viii. c. 21):—

> "That the King and Parliament did not intend by it to decline or vary from the congregation of Christ's Church in anything concerning the very articles of the Catholic Faith of Christendom, and in any other things declared by Scripture and the Word of God necessary for salvation."

1536. The Ten Articles.

Negotiations had been going on in 1535 between England and the Germans who had accepted the Augsburg Confession. Attempts were made to induce Henry VIII. to throw in his lot with the German Protestant Princes. The X. Articles were in reality a declaration as to how far England was at the time prepared to go with the German Protestants, viz., a very little way indeed, and the negotiations failed for the time. The most important advances in a Reforming direction in these Articles were:—

(i.) The rejection of the Papal Supremacy and the substitution of the Royal Supremacy for it.

(ii.) The prominence given to the authority of Holy Scripture. The rule of faith is the Bible, the Three Creeds, the first Four Councils, and the traditions of the fathers consistent with the Bible.

(iii.) Three (*not seven*) Sacraments are treated of; Baptism, Penance, and the Sacrament of the Altar.

On the practical side, images, honour paid to saints, prayers offered to saints, rites and ceremonies, and practices connected with the doctrine of purgatory, are retained, but guarded from abuse. On comparing the Ten Articles with the Augsburg Confession, we notice that in the latter philosophical doctrines, such as Original Sin and Justification, occupy a much more prominent place. Concerning practice, the Augsburg Confession goes very much farther in a reforming direction than these English Articles: it prescribes the cup for the laity, admits the marriage of priests, condemns vows, and exalts the communion aspect of the Holy Eucharist at the expense of its sacrificial aspect.

1537. The Institution of a Christian Man.

(*Sometimes called* The Bishops' Book, *because it was the outcome of the deliberations of a committee of bishops and divines appointed to draw up a book of religious instruction.*)

This is based to a great extent upon the Ten Articles, and is divided into four parts:—

1. An Exposition of the Apostles' Creed.
2. The *Seven* Sacraments.
3. The Ten Commandments.
4. The Lord's Prayer and Ave Maria, with Articles on Justification and Purgatory.

The prominence given to faith in this book may be accounted an advance in a Reforming direction, but this was balanced by a return to the *Seven* Sacraments.

1538. Negotiations with the Lutheran school of Reformers were at this time renewed, German deputies being sent over to this country to consult with English divines; the result of their deliberations was

The Thirteen Articles, based upon the Ten Articles of 1536 and the Augsburg Confession. These Articles were not published, but have been found amongst Cranmer's papers; they never had any authority in the Church, but they are important because

(1.) They afford evidence of the desire for united action on the part of the Reformers.

(2.) They show how far the Church in this country was at the time prepared to accept the Augsburg Confession.

(3.) The opinions of Cranmer were modified by his discussions with the German deputies.

(4.) They are the medium through which the language of the Augsburg Confession passed into the XLII. Articles, and thence to the XXXIX. Articles.

The Augsburg Confession had allowed the cup to the laity and the marriage of clergy, and had condemned vows and private masses. The English Church had not gone so far as this, and no agreement could be arrived at upon these points. When the German deputies expressed their opinion pretty freely about the Church in this country for withholding the cup from the laity, enforcing the celibacy of the clergy, &c., some defence was thought necessary. The King and Bishop Tonstal drew up a reply to the Germans, but the most effectual reply was,

1539. The Six Article Law.

This marks the final failure of the attempts made in Henry's reign to Lutheranise the English Church; it briefly reaffirms Transubstantiation, Communion in one Kind, Celibacy of the Clergy, the Obligation of Vows, the use of private masses, and of auricular confession.

1543. Necessary Doctrine for any Christian Man.

(*The work of a committee of bishops, approved by the King and by Convocation, and published by Royal authority, hence it is commonly called* The King's Book.)

This is based on the Bishops' Book, but contains additional Articles on Free-Will and Good Works; it also appends a general statement on the nature of Sacraments, and adds a preface on Faith. The King's Book was now the authoritative standard of doctrine of the Church of England, and remained so until the XLII. Articles were issued; it superseded the X. Articles, which up to this time had been in force.

It is commonly stated that the King's Book marks a retrograde step in the Reformation. It is true that

some Roman doctrines are affirmed more strongly than in the Bishops' Book, yet the general spirit of the two books is the same. The doctrines of the nature of the Church, the Royal Supremacy, and the Rule of Faith are laid down with equal fulness, and in the same sense in both books. The King's Book contains unreformed doctrine more rigidly than the Bishops' Book on the following important points:—

(*a*) Communion in one kind.
(*b*) Enforcement of celibacy of the clergy.
(*c*) In treating of Penance, the necessity of absolution by a priest is more strongly affirmed.
(*d*) The use of Scripture is restricted in the Preface to those of gentle birth.

Both books condemn the theory of good works which had been encouraged by Roman abuses.[1]

In the reign of Henry VIII. no real reformation in doctrine had been attempted. The formularies above mentioned were mainly protests against Protestantism, and were so understood on the Continent. The religion of England during the latter part of the reign was Roman Catholicism with the King put in the place of the Pope.[2] Up to the close of the reign the Reformation had proceeded on English lines, and the interference of foreign Protestants had been rather resented.

1549. The First Prayer-Book of Edward VI. may be said to embody the ripe result of the English Reformation properly so called. During the short reign of Edward VI. foreign divines were eagerly welcomed, and the most illustrious of them put into high positions; thus Bucer was made Divinity Professor at Cambridge, Peter Martyr holding the corresponding post at Oxford. The Prayer-

[1] For a detailed comparison of the two books see Appendix II.

[2] Compare the following allusions in Original Letters:—

John Butler and others to Conrad Pellican and others, dated London, March 8, 1539—

"We pass on then to the state of this our kingdom, which is as follows; the ceremonies are still tolerated, but explanations of them are added."

Hooper to Bullinger, from Strasburg, January 27 [1546?]—

"Accept, my dear master, in a very few words, the news from England. As far as true religion is concerned, idolatry is nowhere in greater vigour. Our king has destroyed the pope, but not popery. . . . The impious mass,

Book of 1549 was too conservative for such men as these,[1] and the alterations made in the Book of 1552 were due to their influence.

1552. The Second Prayer-Book of Edward VI. may thus be said to mark the extreme point reached in the attempt to conciliate foreign Reformers.

The Council of Trent had now been sitting for some time and defining the doctrines of Rome in opposition to those of the Reformers. Those who had broken with Rome consequently felt more strongly than ever the need of defining their position, and of presenting, if possible, a combined front against their common adversary. Cranmer especially seems to have cherished the idea of drawing the Continental Protestants and Reformed together, and uniting them with the English Church in the acceptance of a common confession of faith.[2] It was with this object in view that the Archbishop invited the co-operation of so many foreigners. Bucer, Peter Martyr, Fagius, Dryander, John a Lasco, Calvin, and Bullinger were all solicited

the most shameful celibacy of the clergy, the invocation of saints, auricular confession, superstitious abstinence from meats, and purgatory, were never before held by the people in greater esteem than at the present moment."

Dryander to Bullinger, from Cambridge, June 5, 1549—

"Meanwhile this reformation must not be counted lightly of; in this kingdom especially, where there existed heretofore, in the public formularies of doctrine, true popery without the name."

Beza to Bullinger, from Geneva, September 3, 1566, referring to the state of religion in England, says—

"The Papacy was never abolished in that country, but rather transferred to the sovereign."

Withers to the Elector Palatine—

"Under the auspices of Henry, the eighth of that name, England drove away the Roman Antichrist from all her borders, but yet in such a manner as that his authority seemed, not so much suppressed, as transferred to the king. The mass and other relics of Popish filthiness retained their former place and estimation."

[1] *Cf.* the letter of Geo. Withers to the Elector Palatine (*Zurich Letters*, vol. ii. p. 159), where, speaking of Edward's first Prayer-Book, he says:—

"He set forth a form of public prayer written in English, which, however, scarcely differed in any respect from the Latin, except that all the most glaring errors were abolished. The administration of the Sacraments altogether savours of Lutheranism."

[2] Cranmer thus writes to Melancthon, from London, February 10, 1549:—

"I am aware that you have often desired that wise and godly men should take counsel together, and, having compared their opinions, send forth under the sanction of their authority some work that should embrace the chief

to aid in the settlement of disputed questions. Melancthon was also invited to help, but seems to have treated the idea as impracticable. It was doubtless from the hope of the various Reformed bodies eventually coming to an agreement that the publication of the Articles was so long deferred, but at length there appeared

1553. THE FORTY-TWO ARTICLES.[1]

The Articles of 1538 were taken as the basis of these Articles, but the opinions of Cranmer were undergoing a change;[2] he had, at this time, passed from his Lutheran to his Zwinglian phase, and accordingly we find that in 1553 the Augsburg Confession has receded very much into the background. Only six Articles were adopted from it, either wholly or in part, viz., I., II., IX., XIX., XXV., XXXI.; and, what is more remarkable, distinctively Lutheran language was rejected, especially in the Articles on Justification and on the Sacraments. It is a very difficult question to decide whether these Articles really had any authority in the Church. The title runs thus:—

> "Articles agreed on by the Bishoppes and other learned menne, in the Synode at London, in the yere of our Lorde Godde MDLII., for the auoiding of controuersie in opinions and the establishement of a godlie concorde in certeine matiers of Religion."

---

subjects of ecclesiastical doctrine, and transmit the truth uncorrupted to posterity. This object we are anxiously endeavouring to accomplish to the utmost of our power."—*Original Letters*, vol. i. pp. 21, 22.

See also the Archbishop's letter to Bullinger, dated Lambeth, March 20, 1552:—

"I considered it better, forasmuch as our adversaries are now holding their councils at Trent to confirm their errors, to recommend his Majesty to grant his assistance, that in England, or elsewhere, there might be convoked a synod of the most learned and excellent persons in which provision might be made for the purity of ecclesiastical doctrine, and especially for an agreement upon the sacramentarian controversy. . . . We must not therefore suffer ourselves to be wanting to the Church of God in a matter of such importance. I have written upon the subject to Masters Philip (*i.e.*, Melancthon) and Calvin; and I pray you to devise the means by which this synod may be assembled with the greatest convenience, either in England or elsewhere."—*Original Letters*, vol. i. p. 23.

[1] The XXXIX. Articles were little more than a revision of these. The points of difference will be noted later on.

[2] Extracts from contemporary letters showing the change in Cranmer's opinions are given in Appendix III.

The natural inference from the wording of the title would be that the Articles had been submitted to Convocation. There is evidence, however, which tends to show that they were never presented at all. Cranmer himself admitted that the title was added without his permission, and meant nothing more than that Convocation was sitting at the time.[1] The Archbishop himself seems to have had the chief hand in the compilation of the Articles.[2] Finally, they were published by the "King's Majesty's commandment," June 1553,[3] and all beneficed clergy were ordered to sign them on pain of deprivation. King Edward, however, died in July of the same year, and all through Queen Mary's reign the Articles were in abeyance.

1559. THE ELEVEN ARTICLES.

After the accession of Elizabeth it was intended to revise the XLII. Articles, but meanwhile Arch-

[1] Cranmer's reply to Weston's question runs thus—

> "I was ignorant of the setting to of that title, and as soon as I had knowledge thereof I did not like it; therefore when I complained thereof to the Council, it was answered thus by them, that the book was so entitled because it was set forth in the time of Convocation."—*Cranmer's Works*, IV. pp. 64–65.

Cf. the words of Archdeacon Philpot in Convocation, Oct. 1553. In defence of the Catechism which had appeared under the same sanction as the Articles, he said—

> "This house had granted the authority to make ecclesiastical laws unto certain persons to be appointed by the King's Majesty; and whatsoever laws they, or the most part of them, did set forth, according to the statute in that behalf provided, it might be well said to be done in the Synod of London, although such as be of this house have had no notice thereof before the promulgation; and in this point he thought the setting forth thereof nothing to have slandered the house."—*Britton, Horae Sacramentales*, pp. 9–10.

[2] In 1551 the Archbishop received an order from the King and Privy Council to frame a book of Articles of Religion for preserving and maintaining peace and unity of doctrine in the Church. "In obedience hereunto *he drew up a set* which were delivered to certain other bishops to be inspected and subscribed," &c. (Strype's *Cranmer*, p. 272). In May 1552 the Privy Council sent for these Articles. The Archbishop forwarded them on September 19th to Sir John Cheke. About the beginning of October they were, by the King's order, communicated to other divines, and on November 23rd the Council once more sent them to Cranmer for final revision, the Archbishop returning them the following day. The Articles were thus privately prepared, and were not the result of any public discussion in Convocation.

[3] There was prefixed to the Articles "A shorte catechisme or playne instruction contaynynge the summe of Christian learning set fourth by the King's Majestie's authorities, for all schoolmaisters to teache." This was composed by Poinet, Bishop of Winchester.

bishop Parker drew up XI. Articles for circulation amongst the clergy. The meaning and force of such formularies is well illustrated by these Articles. They make the barest reference to the fundamentals of the Faith, merely affirming the doctrine of the Holy Trinity and referring to the Creeds, but they define the position of the Church of England upon points debated at the time. They lay down—

(*a*) The authority of Scripture.
(*b*) The rights of National Churches, their power to decree ceremonies, &c.
(*c*) The rights of the State; the Royal, as against the Papal, Supremacy.
(*d*) Points of divergence from Rome. Certain practices, such as the use of images, relics, &c., and private masses, are condemned, and the right of the laity to partake of the cup is affirmed, but it is noteworthy that there is no condemnation of the doctrine of Transubstantiation.

This is the most comprehensive of all the series of English Articles. Points debated amongst the Reformers are omitted, and even those who wished to hold Roman doctrine on the Sacraments might subscribe to these Articles, provided only they would accept the Royal Supremacy. The most prominent feature of this formulary is the assertion of the freedom from Papal interference of the National Church, which desires to embrace within itself the whole nation.

A few words should be said about

The Book of Common Prayer, published in this same year, because it throws light upon the state of religious opinion in England at the time. It was the wish of the Queen, Parker, and Cecil to restore the first Prayer-Book of Edward VI., but this was soon found to be impossible, owing to the number and influence of the returned Marian exiles, whose wish it was to remodel the English Church after the pattern of Geneva. The most that could be done was to revive the second Prayer-Book of Edward, which was

of a much more strongly Reforming type than the first. Two very significant changes were however made, much to the annoyance of the returned refugees and their party.[1]

(1.) In the Communion Office the words of administration from the first Book were prefixed to the words of administration as contained in the second Book. So long as the words of the second Book only were used, it might be maintained that that part of the service favoured Calvinistic and anti-sacramental doctrine; but the addition of the words from the first Book was understood at the time, and was doubtless intended, to imply a recognition of the Real Presence.

(2.) The "Ornaments Rubric" was inserted, which restored such vestments of the clergy and furniture of the Church "as were in this Church of England, by the authority of Parliament, in the second year of the reign of King Edward the Sixth." What may be called the "Puritanism" of the Prayer-Book of 1552 was thus altogether neutralised.

1562–3. Convocation met in January of this year. XLII. Articles were presented. These were the XLII. Articles of 1553, which had been revised by Archbishop Parker, aided principally by Cox (Bishop of Ely) and Guest (Bishop of Rochester). Four of the XLII. Articles had been struck out, viz.:—

(1.) *On Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost.*

(2.) *On Grace.*

(3.) *On the Moral Law* [but part of this was incorporated with Art. VII.].

[1] Their opinion is well illustrated by a letter of George Withers to the Elector Palatine—

"The high Parliament of the whole realm was assembled, popery again cast out, and the second form of Prayers, which Edward left behind him at his death, was restored to the Church. But the ceremonies which, as was above stated, were retained in the Church at the first reformation of Edward, are restored under the same name. . . . In what way the Sacraments are disfigured by human inventions will easily appear from the public form of prayer, the royal injunctions, and the admonitions, or (as they call them) the advertisements of the Bishops. . . . What must we say when most of them (*i.e.*, the English clergy) are popish priests, consecrated to perform mass?" —*Zurich Letters*, vol. ii. pp. 161–163.

(4.) *Against the Millenarians.*

Four Articles had been added, viz. :—

(1.) *On the Holy Ghost.*
(2.) *On Good Works.*
(3.) *On the non-participation of the wicked in the Holy Communion.*
(4.) *On Communion in both kinds.*

No less than seventeen Articles had been more or less modified. The Upper House of Convocation omitted three more Articles which condemned opinions no longer of much importance in the controversies of the time: these were:—

Art. XXXIX. "*The resurrection of the dead is not yet brought to pass.*"
Art. XL. "*The souls of them that depart this life do neither die with the bodies nor sleep idly.*"
Art. XLII. "*All men shall not be saved at length.*"

A few verbal changes were also made by Convocation. Thus the number of the Articles was reduced to XXXIX.

In the Latin Articles sanctioned by the Queen *two important changes were made* :—

(1.) A clause was added at the beginning of Art. XX. on the authority of the Church, "**Habet ecclesia ritus statuendi jus et in fidei controversiis auctoritatem.**"
(2.) Article XXIX., on the non-participation of the wicked, was struck out.

The Articles, thus reduced to the number of XXXVIII. by the omission of Article XXIX., were published in 1563 as agreed upon "by the Archbishoppes and Bishoppes of both prouinces and the whole cleargie, in the Conuocation holden at London in the yere of our Lord God MDLXII . . . for the auoiding of the diuersities of opinions, and for the stablishyng of consent touching true religion." They do not seem, however, to have met with general acceptance between 1563 and 1571. In the last-named year they were re-issued both in Latin and

1571. English, with the addition of the Article struck out by the Queen in 1563, and thus, forming XXXIX. in number, were subscribed by both Houses of Convocation. Subscription was enforced by Act of Parliament, being required from all clergy, and from all taking degrees at the Universities.[1]

In this same year the REFORMATIO LEGUM was brought into Parliament. The "*Submission of Clergy*" had provided that no new canons could be put forth by the clergy without the Royal sanction. The old Canon Law remained in force, but it was agreed that it should be revised by a Commission. Three times in Henry's reign a statute was passed for the appointment of the commissioners,[2] but it is not clear that any revision took place. By 3 & 4 Edward VI. 11, the king was empowered to appoint thirty two persons "to *compile* such ecclesiastical laws as should be thought convenient." The Commission was appointed in October 1551, but in the next year the time allowed by the Act expired, and the work had not been completed. In the Parliament which met in 1571 an attempt was made to revive the "*Reformatio Legum*," but the attempt failed, and after this date the book disappears from Church history. As matters now stand, the Canons of the Church universal are binding in this country when they have been accepted by English synods, and *are not contrary to the statute law of the land.* The "*Reformatio Legum*" has thus no authority whatever, but its statements, especially in the section "De Hæresibus," illustrate the Articles, as they often throw light upon the controversies of the time.

[1] The second section of the "*Act for ministers of the Church to be of sound Religion*" (13 Eliz. c. 12) contains the following passage :—

> "If any person ecclesiastical, or which shall have any ecclesiastical living, shall advisedly maintain or affirm any doctrine directly contrary or repugnant to any of the said Thirty-Nine Articles, and being convicted before the Bishop of the diocese, or the Ordinary, or before the Queen's Commissioner in causes ecclesiastical, shall persist therein, or not revoke his error, or, after such revocation, affirm such untrue doctrine, such maintaining, or affirming, or persisting, shall be just cause to deprive such person of his ecclesiastical functions, and it shall be lawful for the Bishop of the diocese, or Ordinary, or such Commissioner, to deprive such person."

[2] 25 Hen. VIII. 19; 27 Hen. VIII. 15; and 35 Hen. VIII. 16.

1595. THE LAMBETH ARTICLES.

The wide prevalence of Calvinistic theology in England during Elizabeth's reign is indicated by the controversy at Cambridge between Whitaker, Regius Professor, and Baro, Margaret Professor, of Divinity, the latter of whom was compelled to resign for teaching that "Christ died sufficiently for all," and for maintaining that this was the doctrine of the English Articles. To this controversy the compilation of the "Lambeth Articles" is ultimately traceable. Archbishop Whitgift, desiring to settle matters, called to his aid certain bishops and divines, and at Lambeth a paper of Articles was drawn up and agreed upon. These Articles are nine in number, and assert in most uncompromising form the main points of the Calvinistic Theology. They never had any authority whatever. At
1604. the Hampton Court Conference the Puritans petitioned that the "Lambeth Articles" might be added to the Thirty-nine, but the request was refused.[1] The history of these Articles suggests two important reflections:—

(1.) The Calvinistic party could not have been by any means satisfied that the XXXIX. Articles were Calvinistic in sense, otherwise they would scarcely have thought it necessary to add a statement of Calvinistic doctrine to them.[2]

(2.) When an express statement of Calvinistic doctrines was offered for the acceptance of the English Church, it was deliberately refused. Such doctrines therefore form no part of the theology of our Church.

1604. The fifth of the CANONS of this date lays down that,

"Whosoever shall hereafter affirm that any of the nine-and-thirty Articles agreed upon by the Archbishops and

---

[1] They were, however, incorporated with the Irish Articles of 1615. See Appendix VI.

[2] That the Calvinistic party was not satisfied with the Church of England Articles is also clearly shown by the action of the Westminster "Assembly of Divines," who in 1643 commenced a revision of the Articles, "*with a design to render their sense more express and determinate in favour of Calvinism*" (see Neal, "History of the Puritans," vol. i. p. 48, ed. 1754). The committee actually revised the first fifteen Articles. The text of these as revised is given at length in Appendix IV.

Bishops of both provinces, and the whole clergy, in the convocation holden at London, in the year of our Lord God one thousand five hundred and sixty-two, for avoiding diversities of opinions, and for the establishing of consent touching true Religion, are in any part superstitious or erroneous, or such as he may not with a good conscience subscribe unto; let him be excommunicated *ipso facto*, and not restored, but only by the Archbishop, after his repentance, and public revocation of such his wicked errors."

1628. His Majesty's Declaration was prefixed to the XXXIX. Articles. Its immediate cause seems to have been the strong censure of Arminianism uttered by the House of Commons, and it was put forth with a view of settling or smoothing the raging controversy between Arminians and Calvinists. It enjoins that the Articles be taken "*in the literal and grammatical sense*," and points to Convocation as the proper body for settling disputed points of doctrine or discipline. The "Declaration" was drawn up by Laud, but not submitted to Convocation, so that it had not the sanction of the Church, but was put forth solely on the King's authority.

1635. The XXXIX. Articles adopted by the Convocation of the Church of Ireland.

1804. The Synod of the Scottish Episcopal Church accepted the XXXIX. Articles.

1865. In this year there was passed "*An Act to amend the law as to the declarations and subscriptions to be made, and oaths to be taken, by the clergy*" (28 and 29 Vict. c. 112). This Act provides that a clergyman, on being instituted to a living, shall, on the first Sunday that he officiates there, "publicly and openly in the presence of his congregation read the whole Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, and immediately after reading them, make the declaration of assent to them."

III

ANALYSIS OF THE XXXIX. ARTICLES

The Articles may be divided into groups under the following heads:

I. Articles setting forth the Foundation Truths of Religion (I.–V.).

The great truths embodied in the Ancient Creeds and held in all ages by the Church are here set forth, with very little in the way of comment or exposition.

II. Articles giving the Rule of Faith (VI.–VIII.).

The great principle which underlay the Reformation is laid down, viz., the sufficiency of Holy Scripture as containing all things necessary to salvation.

III. Articles dealing with Individual Religion (IX.–XVIII.)

These set forth the theory of man's unregenerate and regenerate state, and deal with those points more particularly upon which variety of opinion existed amongst those who had separated from Rome. Articles IX.–XIV. are concerned more especially with the great subject of Justification, which had been brought into such prominence by Luther's work in Germany. Articles XV.–XVIII. are connected rather with those questions upon which the systematic teaching of Calvin turned.

IV. Articles dealing with Corporate Religion (XIX.–XXXVI.).

These fall into two groups—(*a*) Those dealing with the nature, constitution, order, and authority of the Church (XIX.–XXI., XXIII., XXIV., XXXII.–XXXVI.). (*b*) Those setting forth the doctrine of the Sacraments, and including the condemnation of Purgatory, &c. (XXII., XXV.–XXXI.). It is in this group that we have the greatest divergence from the Church of Rome.

V. Articles dealing with National Religion (XXXVII.–XXXIX.).

These treat of the Church and of the individual Christian in their relation to the State.

ARTICLES

AGREED UPON

BY THE ARCHBISHOPS AND BISHOPS OF BOTH PROVINCES, AND THE WHOLE CLERGY,

IN THE CONVOCATION HOLDEN AT LONDON IN THE YEAR 1562, FOR THE AVOIDING OF DIVERSITIES OF OPINIONS, AND FOR THE ESTABLISHING OF CONSENT TOUCHING TRUE RELIGION:

REPRINTED BY HIS MAJESTY'S COMMANDMENT,

WITH HIS ROYAL DECLARATION

PREFIXED THEREUNTO.

HIS MAJESTY'S DECLARATION[1]

Being by God's Ordinance, according to our just Title, Defender of the Faith, and Supreme Governor[2] of the Church, within these our Dominions, we hold it most agreeable to this our kingly office, and our own religious zeal, to conserve and maintain the Church committed to our charge, in the unity of true Religion, and in the bond of peace; and not to suffer unnecessary Disputations, Altercations, or Questions to be raised, which may nourish faction both in the Church and Commonwealth. We have, therefore, upon mature deliberation, and with the advice of so many of our Bishops as might conveniently be called together, thought fit to make this Declaration following:—

That the Articles of the Church of England (which have been allowed and authorised heretofore, and which our Clergy generally have subscribed unto) do contain the true Doctrine of the Church of England, agreeable to God's Word; which we do therefore ratify and confirm, requiring all our loving subjects to continue in the uniform profession thereof, and prohibiting the least difference from the said Articles: which to that end we command to be new printed, and this our Declaration to be published therewith.

That we are Supreme Governor of the Church of England: and that if any difference arise about the external policy, concerning the Injunctions, Canons, and other Constitutions whatsoever thereto belonging, the Clergy in their Convocation is to order and settle them, having first obtained leave under our Broad Seal so to do: and we approving their said Ordinances and Constitutions; providing that none be made contrary to the Laws and Customs of the Land.

That out of our princely care that the Churchmen may do the work which is proper unto them, the Bishops and Clergy from time to time in Convocation, upon their humble desire,

[1] Prefixed to the Articles in 1628, see p. 17.

[2] For the history of this title see notes on Art. XXXVII.

shall have Licence under our Broad Seal to deliberate of, and to do all such things, as being made plain by them, and assented unto by us, shall concern the settled continuance of the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church of England now established; from which we will not endure any varying or departing in the least degree.

That for the present, though some differences have been ill raised, yet we take comfort in this, that all Clergymen within our Realm have always most willingly subscribed to the Articles established; which is an argument to us, that they all agree in the true, usual, literal meaning of the said Articles; and that even in those curious points,[1] in which the present differences lie, men of all sorts take the Articles of the Church of England to be for them; which is an argument again that none of them intend any desertion of the Articles established.

That therefore in these both curious and unhappy differences, which have for so many hundred years, in different times and places, exercised the Church of Christ, we will, that all further curious search be laid aside, and these disputes shut up in God's promises, as they be generally set forth to us in the Holy Scriptures,[2] and the general meaning of the Articles of the Church of England according to them. And that no man hereafter shall either print, or preach, to draw the Article aside any way, but shall submit to it in the plain and full meaning thereof; and shall not put his own sense or comment to be the meaning of the Article, but shall take it in the literal and grammatical sense.

That if any Public Reader, in either of our Universities, or any Head or Master of a College, or any other person respectively in either of them, shall affix any new sense to any Article, or shall publicly read, determine, or hold any public disputation, or suffer any such to be held either way, in either the Universities or Colleges respectively; or if any Divine in the Universities shall preach or print anything either way, other than is already established in Convocation with our Royal Assent; he, or they the offenders, shall be liable to our displeasure, and the Church's censure in our Commission Ecclesiastical, as well as any other; and we will see there shall be due execution upon them.

[1] Viz., the points in dispute between the Calvinistic party and those whom, no account of their opposition to them, they designated Arminians.

[2] See notes on Art. XVII.

ARTICLES OF RELIGION

ARTICLE I

OF FAITH IN THE HOLY TRINITY.

There is but one living and true God, everlasting, without body, parts, or passions; of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness; the Maker and Preserver of all things both visible and invisible. And in unity of this Godhead there be three Persons, of one substance, power, and eternity: the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

DE FIDE IN SACROSANCTAM TRINITATEM.

Unus est vivus et verus *Deus*, *aeternus*, *incorporeus*, *impartibilis*, impassibilis; *immensae potentiae*, *sapientiae*, *ac bonitatis; Creator et Conservator omnium* tum *visibilium*, tum *invisibilium*. Et in unitate hujus divinae naturae, *tres sunt Personae*, *ejusdem essentiae*, *potentiae*, ac aeternitatis, *Pater*, *Filius*, *et Spiritus Sanctus*.

§ 1.—*SOURCE.*

Largely borrowed from the Augsburg Confession, Part I., Art. I., through the medium of the XIII. Articles. The words printed in italics are common to all three formularies.

§ 2.—*OBJECT.*

The Article of course excludes Arian and Sabellian heretics. Its immediate object doubtless was to condemn the Anabaptists, and kindred spirits, who had revived these heresies at the period of the Reformation, many of them having renounced all belief in the Holy Trinity.[1]

[1] That even those Articles which affirm the fundamental doctrines of the faith were called forth by the needs of the time is abundantly proved by contemporary documents; see, *e.g.*, letter written by Ridley to Bradford shortly before his death (*Works*, p. 367, ed. Parker Society):—

"Whereas you write of the outrageous rule that Satan, our ghostly enemy, beareth abroad in the world, whereby he stirreth, and raiseth so pestilent and heinous heresies, as some to deny the blessed Trinity, some the Divinity

§ 3.—*EXPOSITION.*

(1) The Being of God.

"There is but one living and true God."

Belief in the existence of God is the very foundation of all religion (Heb. xi. 6). His existence does not admit of demonstration, yet is a matter of reasonable certainty, being testified to by

(*a*) *The phenomena of nature* (Job xii. 7–10; Rom. i. 20). The argument for the existence of God from natural phenomena falls under two heads:—

(i.) The argument from causation. The succession of causes which we observe in nature must have derived its origin from some First Cause. In the words of Herbert Spencer, "The assumption of the existence of a first cause of the universe is a necessity of thought."

(ii.) The argument from adaptation. The order and usefulness of the world, and all things therein, point to a wise and mighty Will behind it (Acts xiv. 17). So John Stuart Mill, in his work "On Theism," confesses, "I think it must be allowed that, in the present state of our knowledge, the adaptations in nature afford a large balance of probability in favour of creation by intelligence."

(*b*) *The moral sense of mankind* (Rom. ii. 15). Should we not see in the obligatory influence of conscience, the sense of right and wrong, and of responsibility, the image, and therefore the proof, of the Divine Mind?

Thus we follow alike the strongest presumption of our reason, and the best intuition of the soul, when we believe that God is.

The existence of God is confirmed, and His character more clearly manifested to us by *Revelation.* It was the work of Christ to declare to us the Father[1] (S. John i. 18; *cf.* xvii. 6).

of our Saviour Christ, some the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, some the baptism of infants, some original sin, and to be infected with the errors of the Pelagians, and to re-baptize those that have been baptized with Christ's baptism already; alas, Sir, this doth declare this time and these days to be wicked indeed."

[1] This declarative aspect of Christ's work is especially prominent in the Gospel according to S. John.

Being Himself "the Image of the invisible God" (Col. i. 15), He showed the Father by exhibiting in Himself the moral image of God. Those who saw Him saw the Father (S. John xii. 45; xiv. 9). Those who hearkened to Him heard the words of the Father (S. John vii. 16; viii. 28; xiv. 24). The whole of His perfect life was a manifestation of the Father, with Whom He is one (S. John x. 30), and from Whom He came forth (S. John xvi. 28), His mission being attested by (*a*) fulfilment of prophecies (S. John v. 46), and by (*b*) miracles (S. John v. 36; xv. 24).

God is:—

one (Deut. vi. 4; Isa. xliv. 8; S. Mark xii. 29; 1 Cor. viii. 4).

living, *i.e.* self-existent, having life in Himself (Exod. iii. 14; Jer. x. 10; S. John v. 26; 1 Thess. i. 9).

true (ἀληθινός, 1 Thess. i. 9; S. John xvii. 3)—the meaning of the Greek word is 'genuine,' denoting that which truly and completely is that which it professes to be. The sense is therefore that there is One only who perfectly fulfils the conception we form of what God should be.

(2) The Attributes of God.

"**Everlasting, without body, parts, or passions; of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness.**"

The Divine attributes given in the Article may be classified as follows:—

(*a*) *Positive attributes*, such as impute to God the possession of certain qualities.

everlasting (Deut. xxxii. 40; Ps. cii. 27; Rev. i. 8). This follows upon recognition of God as the 'First Cause,' which must exist of Itself, and therefore must always exist.

of infinite power (S. Matt. xix. 26; but see 2 Tim. ii. 13; Heb. vi. 18). Thus 'Almighty'[1] is a title often applied to God in Holy Scripture. When we say "God can do everything," we of course exclude those things which are in themselves impossible; *e.g.*, that a thing should exist and not exist at the same moment.

[1] אֵל שַׁדַּי, παντοκράτωρ, Lat. 'omnipotens,' (*i.e.* strictly, "having power over all things").

We likewise except those things which contradict the perfection of God. He is of infinite power, but He cannot sin. Sin is, in fact, a mark of weakness, not of power.

of infinite wisdom (Ps. cxlvii. 5 ; Rom. xi. 33). By wisdom we mean knowledge of things together with skill to apply that knowledge.

of infinite goodness (Lev. xi. 45 ; S. Luke xviii. 19 ; S. James i. 17). He is perfectly good in Himself, and the Author and Giver of all good.

(*b*) *Negative attributes*, such as deny to God the possession of certain qualities.

without body (**incorporeus**), *i.e.*, immaterial, spiritual (S. John iv. 24 ; v. 37 ; *cf.* S. Luke xxiv. 39).

without parts (**impartibilis**), *i.e.*, incapable of division. There can be nothing of the nature of conflict or change with God (Ps. cii. 26, 27).

without passions (**impassibilis**), *i.e.*, incapable of suffering. Whatever suffers does so from some agent stronger than itself ; this therefore follows from the infinite power of God.[1]

(3) God's Relation to the Universe.

"**The Maker and Preserver of all things both visible and invisible.**"

The relation of God to the universe is twofold. He is—

(*a*) **Maker**. The universe is not eternal, or self-originated, neither is it an involuntary development of the Divine Nature, but it is dependent for its existence upon the Will of God, having been called into being at a definite point of time by Him (Gen. i. 1 ; Acts iv. 24 ; Col. i. 16 ; Rev. iv. 11). Pantheism therefore, which confounds God with the universe, is not a true account of things.

(*b*) **Preserver**. Having created the world, God did not leave it to go on of itself, but He is omnipresent,

[1] It should be noted that the English rendering of the last two attributes suggests a different sense :—

'without parts'—*i.e.*, face, hands, eyes, &c.

'without passions.'. (*See* Num. xxiii. 19 ; Acts xiv. 15 ; S. James v. 17.) The organs and feelings of man are indeed often attributed to the Deity in Holy Scripture (*e.g.*, Prov. xv. 3 ; Exod. xx. 5), but this is done by a figure of speech, in accommodation to human understanding.

immanent, guiding, controlling, and directing (S. John v. 17). We speak sometimes of the universe as governed by natural laws. Scientific research may discover certain general laws according to which the course of nature is ordered. Such laws are but the expression of the Divine will (Col. i. 17; Acts xvii. 28). Deism therefore, which separates the universe from God, so far as its present operations are concerned, is not a true account of things.

(4) The Doctrine of the Holy Trinity.

"**And in unity of this Godhead there be three Persons, of one substance, power, and eternity; the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.**"

Person—an individual moral agent.

Substance (**essentia**)—the nature or essence whereof one or more persons subsist.

"*Trinity*" is the word used by the Church to express shortly the Revelation of the Being of God contained in the New Testament, that blessed Revelation which makes the New Testament what it is, viz., a new Covenant of God with man, through Jesus Christ the Redeemer, and the Holy Spirit the Sanctifier. Whilst the doctrine is not philosophically developed in the books of the New Testament, it is involved in the very substance of its teaching; *e.g.*, the formula of Baptism given by our Lord Himself (S. Matt. xxviii. 19) clearly implies in the Godhead, (*a*) Distinction of Persons, (*b*) Equality of Persons, and (*c*) Unity of Persons, for it is said εἰς τὸ ὄνομα in the singular. God then is "Three in One," we must not "confound the Persons"[1] (S. John xiv. 16); yet He is "One in Three," we must not "divide the Substance"[1] (S. Matt. xxviii. 19; *cf.* S. John x. 30).[2]

This doctrine is opposed to—

(*a*) *Tritheism* or *Polytheism* of any kind.

"We are forbidden by the Catholic Religion to say there be three Gods."[1]

(*b*) *Sabellianism*, according to which God, Who is one person, reveals Himself at one time in the character of the Father, at another in that of the Son, at another in that

[1] Athanasian Creed.

[2] In the latter passage notice the neuter ἕν, implying 'one essence,' not 'one person.'

of the Holy Spirit. But thus the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit would be personations rather than persons.

(*c*) *Arianism*, and kindred doctrines such as *Unitarianism*, *Socinianism*, &c., according to which the Father alone is God in the full and proper sense of the term.

The doctrine of the Holy Trinity is no mere abstract doctrine, or dark speculation without practical value, but as it is fundamental to theology, so also it is to practical piety, having an intimate bearing upon the Christian life. We are baptized into the Name of the Holy Trinity, and it is our blessed privilege to rejoice in the knowledge of the Father's love (1 S. John iv. 19), and to experience the power of the Son, through His death and resurrection, to cleanse us from sin and keep us in newness of life (Phil. iii. 10), a power which we share through the presence of the Holy Spirit with us, Who brings us ever into closer union with the living Christ (2 Cor. xiii. 14).

ARTICLE II

OF THE WORD, OR SON OF GOD, WHICH WAS MADE VERY MAN.

The Son, which is the Word of the Father, begotten from everlasting of the Father, the very and eternal God, of one Substance with the Father, took Man's nature in the womb of the Blessed Virgin, of her substance: so that two whole and perfect Natures, that is to say the Godhead and Manhood, were joined together in one Person, never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God and very Man; Who truly suffered, was crucified, dead, and buried, to reconcile His Father to us, and to be a Sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for all actual sins of men.

DE VERBO, SIVE FILIO DEI, QUI VERUS HOMO FACTUS EST.

Filius, qui *est verbum* Patris, **ab aeterno a Patre genitus, verus et aeternus Deus, ac Patri consubstantialis** *in utero Beatae Virginis*, ex illius substantia, *naturam humanam assumpsit*, ita *ut duae naturae, divina et humana*, integre atque perfecte, *in unitate personae*, fuerint *inseparabiliter conjunctae*, ex quibus est *Unus Christus, verus Deus, et verus Homo*, qui *vere passus* est, *crucifixus, mortuus, et sepultus, ut Patrem nobis reconciliaret, esset*que *hostia, non tantum pro culpa originis*, verum *etiam pro omnibus actualibus hominum peccatis.*

§ 1.—*SOURCE.*

Mainly from the Augsburg Confession, Part I., Art. III., through the medium of the XIII. Articles. The clause in **thick type** was added in 1563 from the Wurtemburg Confession, Art. II.

§ 2.—*OBJECT.*

The doctrinal excesses of the Anabaptists made it necessary for the Church, at the time of the Reformation, to reaffirm the Catholic doctrine of our Lord's Incarnation. The prevalence of heresies on this central doctrine of the Christian faith is clear from the following evidence:—

By Stat. 32 Hen. VIII. c. 49, § 11, those were excluded

from the king's pardon who held "that Christ took no bodily substance of our blessed lady."

Hooper, writing to Bullinger from London, June 25, 1549, says:—

> "The Anabaptists flock to the place (*i.e.*, of public lecture), and give me much trouble with their opinions respecting the Incarnation of the Lord; for they deny altogether that Christ was born of the Virgin Mary according to the flesh."—*Original Letters*, vol. i. p. 65.

Martin Micronius, in a letter to Bullinger, dated London, May 20, 1550, writes:—

> "And indeed it is a matter of the first importance that the Word of God should be preached here in German, to guard against the heresies which are introduced by our countrymen. There are Arians, Marcionists, Libertines, Danists, and the like monstrosities, in great numbers. A few days since, namely, on the 2nd of May, a certain woman was burnt alive for denying the Incarnation of Christ."[1]—*Original Letters*, vol. ii. p. 560.

Micronius, writing again to Bullinger from London, August 14, 1551, says:—

> "We have not only to contend with the Papists, who are almost everywhere ashamed of their errors, but much more with the Sectaries and Epicureans, and pseudo-evangelicals. In addition to the ancient errors respecting paedo-baptism, the Incarnation of Christ, the authority of the magistrate, the lawfulness of an oath, the property and community of goods, and the like, new ones are rising up every day, with which we have to contend. The chief opponents, however, of Christ's Divinity are the Arians, who are now beginning to shake our Churches with greater violence than ever, as they deny the conception of Christ by the Virgin."—*Original Letters*, vol. ii. p. 574.

Richard Hilles writes to Bullinger from London, March 8, 1571:—

> "But I grieve very much that the pestiferous sect of Arians is budding forth again in many other places besides Switzerland."—*Zurich Letters*, vol. ii. p. 182.

See also Ridley's letter to Bradford, quoted above, pp. 23, 24, and compare 'Reformatio Legum,' De Haeresibus, cap. 5:—

> "Circa duplicem Christi naturam perniciosus est et varius error: ex quibus alii sunt ex Arianorum secta, Christum ita ponentes

[1] The woman referred to is Joan Bucher, sometimes called Joan of Kent.

hominem ut Deum negent. Alii eum sic Deum judicant ut hominem non agnoscant, et de corpore nugantur de cœlo divinitus assumpto, et in virginis uterum lapso, quod tanquam in transitu per Mariam quasi per canalem aut fistulam praeterfluxit."

§ 3.—*EXPOSITION.*

(1) The Nature of the Son of God.

"**The Son, which is the Word of the Father, begotten from everlasting of the Father, the very and eternal God, of one substance with the Father.**"

the Word (S. John i. 1). The significance of the title as applied to the Second Person in the Blessed Trinity is that as a word declares thought, so does the Son reveal the Father (S. John i. 18); as a man makes known his will by word of mouth, so God reveals His will by His Son (Heb. i. 1).

begotten expresses here not an event, but a relationship which has subsisted **from everlasting.** He is "begotten" or else He would not be "Son," but "from everlasting" or else He would not be God (Col. i. 15; Heb. i. 5–12).

very and eternal God. Christ is not metaphorically but properly and truly called God (Rom. ix. 5;[1] S. John i. 18;[2] v. 26; 1 S. John v. 20).

of one substance with the Father (Patri consubstantialis). These words correspond to the well-known clause of the Nicene Creed, ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρί. "Of one essence" would be a better representation of the meaning in English (S. John x. 30; v. 26).

(2) The Doctrine of the Incarnation.

"**Took man's nature in the womb of the Blessed Virgin, of her substance: so that two whole and perfect natures, that is to say the Godhead and Manhood, were joined together in one Person, never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God and very Man.**"

Took man's nature (Phil. ii. 6–8). An important statement. The Divine Nature did not become human, neither did the Son of God take *a man's nature,* but *man's nature,* i.e. *human nature,* assuming the same

[1] The doxology in this passage is doubtless rightly taken as referring to Christ.

[2] Note that the reading of this passage according to ℵBCL is ὁ μονογενὴς θεός.

nature which is in all other men, assuming it in its first original element before it had come to have any personal subsistence (Heb. ii. 16).

in the womb of the Blessed Virgin (S. Matt. i. 20; S. Luke i. 30–35; Gal. iv. 4). The Divine Nature did not descend upon the man Jesus at some period of his earthly life, as Nestorians taught, but He Who was born of Mary was really God, so that the Blessed Virgin may be called *θεοτόκος*.[1] *Cf.* the Apology of Aristides,[2] § II., "God came down from heaven, and from a Hebrew Virgin took and clad Himself with flesh, and in a daughter of man there dwelt the Son of God."

The followers of Cerinthus and the Ebionites are thus excluded, who held that Jesus Christ had no existence before His Mother.

so that two whole and perfect natures . . . were joined together in one person, never to be divided.

There were four great heresies on this subject in early times.

(*a*) Arians denied the Divinity of Christ.

(*b*) Apollinarians tampered with His Manhood.

(*c*) Nestorians divided the Divinity and the Manhood, making Christ two Persons.

(*d*) Eutychians confounded the two natures, so as to make from them one composite nature, neither human nor Divine.

The Church defended the faith at four General Councils.

(*a*) At Nicæa, A.D. 325, affirming that Christ is truly (*ἀληθῶς*) God.

(*b*) At Constantinople, A.D. 381, affirming that He is perfectly (*τελέως*) man.

(*c*) At Ephesus, A.D. 431, declaring that the two natures are indivisibly (*ἀδιαιρέτως*) united.

(*d*) At Chalcedon, A.D. 451, laying down that at the same time He is distinctly (*ἀσυγχύτως*) God and man.

See Rev. i. 5, 6, 17, 18; Acts xx. 28.

[1] The title was authoritatively adopted at the Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431, Nestorius having raised an objection to it. It is the common title of the Blessed Virgin in the Eastern Church at the present day.

[2] An Apology for Christianity presented to the Emperor Antoninus Pius by Aristides, an Athenian philosopher. It was written between 120 and 140 A.D., and recovered in a Syriac Version at the Convent of S. Katherine, Sinai, by Mr. Rendel Harris, in 1889.

We have seen that the two natures are joined together in Christ, but not confused: from these two natures, each of which still remains entire, is made one Person,[1] of the whole of which Person that is sometimes predicated which is proper only to one of the natures; see, *e.g.*, Acts xx. 28. This manner of expression is called "*communicatio idiomatum*" (*i.e.*, sharing of properties). By this it is not meant that there is ever any mutual participation of both natures, but always a co-operation and association of the two.

The words "**never to be divided**" are important. The humanity was not laid aside at the Ascension.

(3.) The Doctrine of the Atonement.

"**Who truly suffered, was crucified, dead, and buried, to reconcile His Father to us, and to be a Sacrifice not only for original guilt, but also for all actual sins of men.**"

truly suffered. Thus are excluded all forms of the Docetic heresy, which teach that the Son of God became man in appearance only, and that His humanity, His sufferings, &c., were therefore unreal.

to reconcile . . . to be a sacrifice.

When treating of the change brought about in the relation of man to God by the death of Christ, the following words are used in the New Testament:—

(*a*) καταλλάσσειν and cognate words.

Man was in a state of enmity against God (Eph. ii. 3), but Christ reconciles the two (Rom. v. 10; 2 Cor. v. 18–20; Eph. ii. 16; Col. i. 20). We should notice that while the Article speaks of God being reconciled to us by the death of Christ,[2] on the other hand in the passages of Scripture

[1] This is called the "*hypostatic union*," a technical term of theology denoting the joining of the two natures in one ὑπόστασις.

[2] The expression of the Article "*ut Patrem nobis reconciliaret*" is taken, as stated above, from the Augsburg Confession; the same manner of presenting the truth is also found in the Second Helvetic Confession, Art. XI.:—

"Porro passione et morte sua, omnibusque adeo quae a suo in carne adventu nostra causa fecit et pertulit, reconciliavit omnibus fidelibus Dominus noster Patrem cœlestem."

See also the Homily of Repentance, First Part, p. 564:—

"We have need of a Mediator for to bring and reconcile us unto Him, who for our sins is angry with us. The same is Jesus Christ; who, being true and natural God, equal and of one substance with the Father, did at the time appointed take upon Him our frail nature, in the blessed Virgin's womb, and that of her undefiled substance; that so He might be a Mediator betwixt God and us, and pacify His wrath."

referred to the enmity is represented as on man's side, and man is spoken of as reconciled to God. Though the expression is not used, nevertheless, in the New Testament, God is thought of as being reconciled to man; we read of an ὀργὴ θεοῦ (Rom. i. 18; Eph. ii. 3, v. 6), which must not be considered merely as an anthropomorphic mode of expression, but as representing something real in the nature and disposition of God towards man in his natural state.

(*b*) ἀπολύτρωσις, λύτρον, and cognate words.

These give the idea of deliverance as from slavery (S. Matt. xx. 28; Rom. iii. 24; 1 Cor. i. 30; Eph. i. 7; Col. i. 14). Man was in a condition of slavery to sin (Rom. vii. 14; *cf.* S. John viii. 34), but Christ paid the ransom (1 Tim. ii. 6) and redeemed him (1 Cor. vi. 20, vii. 23; Acts xx. 28).

(*c*) ἱλαστήριον, ἱλασμός.

These words have in the New Testament the sense of "expiation" which takes place by means of sacrifice or offering (Rom. iii. 25; 1 S. John ii. 2).[1]

(*d*) προσφορά, θυσία.

See Eph. v. 2, where these words are used of Christ's death, signifying its virtue as a propitiatory sacrifice.

The Article, within Holy Scripture, strongly insists on Christ's Death as an atoning sacrifice; thus our Church discards any merely exemplary view of the Death of Christ, as also the theory which sees in it only an impressive moral exhibition.

for original guilt. See notes on Art. IX.

for all actual sins of men.

The omission of the word "**all**" in some modern copies is entirely without authority. The wording is important because strongly anti-Calvinistic,[2] Calvinism teaching that Christ did not die for all sins, but for those of the elect only. That the Calvinistic party considered the word "**all**" hostile to their doctrine is proved by the fact that

[1] ἱλαστήριον in LXX. generally represents the Hebrew כַּפֹּרֶת, the Cover of the Ark, the Mercy-Seat (*cf.* Heb. ix. 5).

[2] The English Church emphatically asserts the sufficiency of Christ's Sacrifice "for the sins of the whole world." (*Cf.* Art. XXXI., where see notes.)

in the text as revised by the Westminster divines it is wanting.[1]

Original guilt and actual sins are both mentioned in the Article in order to emphasise the truth that the effect of the Atonement wrought by Christ's Death is utterly to abolish all sin.

[1] See Appendix IV. ; and *cf.* WESTMINSTER CONFESSION, xi. 4 :—

"God did, from all eternity, decree to justify all the elect ; and Christ did, in the fulness of time, die for their sins."

ARTICLE III

OF THE GOING DOWN OF CHRIST INTO HELL.	DE DESCENSU CHRISTI AD INFEROS.
As Christ died for us and was buried, so also it is to be believed that He went down into Hell.	Quemadmodum Christus pro nobis mortuus est et sepultus, ita est etiam credendus ad inferos descendisse.

§ 1.—*SOURCE.*

This Article was composed by the English Reformers. It was a good deal longer as it stood in the XLII. Articles, being continued as follows:—

For the bodie lay in the sepulchre, untill the Resurrection: but his Ghoste departing from him, was with the ghostes that were in prison, or in Helle, and didde preache to the same, as the place of S. Peter dooeth testifie.	Nam corpus usque ad resurrectionem in sepulchro jacuit, Spiritus ab illo emissus, cum spiritibus qui in carcere sive in inferno detinebantur, fuit, illisque praedicavit, quemadmodum testatur Petri locus.

This paragraph was omitted in 1563.

§ 2.—*OBJECT.*

The doctrine of our Lord's descent into Hell seems to have been much agitated in this country. Micronius, writing to Bullinger from London, May 20, 1550, says:—

> "They are disputing about the descent of Christ into Hell."—*Original Letters*, vol. ii. p. 561.

The violence of the controversy on this subject, and especially concerning the bearing of the text of S. Peter referred to on the doctrine, was most likely the cause of Convocation dropping the latter part of the Article in 1563. Alley, Bishop of Exeter,

drew up papers for this Convocation, in which he thus alludes to the subject:—

> "First for matters of Scripture, namely, for this place which is written in the Epistle of S. Peter, that Christ went down into hell and preached to the souls that were in prison. There have been in my diocese great invectives between the preachers one against the other."[1]

§ 3.—*EXPOSITION.*

The use of the word **hell** in the Article, as in the Apostles' Creed, is a little unfortunate, because it is often used to signify the place of torment. Here it is used in the sense of the Greek ᾅδης, or the Hebrew שְׁאוֹל, meaning the place of departed spirits. The purport of the Article, therefore, is that our Lord was true man as well in death as in life; that His Body lay in the grave, and His Spirit went to the place of departed spirits (*cf.* S. Luke xxiii. 43).

For Scripture testimony see the following passages:—

(*a*) Acts ii. 25–31, where S. Peter quotes the words of the Psalmist, "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt Thou suffer Thine Holy One to see corruption" (Ps. xvi. 10), and applies them to the Resurrection of our Lord, "Whose soul was not left in hell." This argument implies that the soul of Christ had been in hell.

(*b*) 1 S. Peter iii. 18, 19. This famous passage represents the soul of Christ as acting, after the death of the body, among the souls who were in the place of departed spirits, those especially being mentioned who were disobedient at the time of the flood. Christ is said to have preached (ἐκήρυξεν) to these. The word is one generally used in the Gospels of the work of Christ in proclaiming the Gospel of the Kingdom, preaching repentance (*e.g.*, S. Matt. iv. 17, 23). If we so understand the passage our interpretation is confirmed by a comparison with 1 S. Peter iv. 6—all are to be on the same footing at the Judgment; therefore all, dead as well as living, have the offer of the salvation of Christ.[2]

[1] Strype, "Annals," i. 348 (ed. 1725).

[2] Of course, when thus interpreted, the passage does not support the idea that those who have had the offer of Christ's salvation in this life, and refused it, will have another chance after death. Inadequate explanations of S. Peter's meaning are—(*a*) that given by Bishop Pearson, viz., that the Spirit of Christ

We have seen that the disputes as to the meaning of the passage in S. Peter caused the reference to it in the Article to be struck out. Our Church, however, has expressed her view of its meaning by appointing the passage to be read as the Epistle on Easter Even.

preached by the mouth of Noah to the ante-Diluvians; (*b*) that the proclamation spoken of was one of condemnation.

ARTICLE IV

OF THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST.

Christ did truly rise again from death, and took again His body, with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of Man's nature; wherewith He ascended into Heaven, and there sitteth, until He return to judge all men at the last day.

DE RESURRECTIONE CHRISTI.

Christus vere a mortuis resurrexit, suumque corpus cum carne, ossibus, omnibusque ad integritatem humanae naturae pertinentibus, recepit, cum quibus in coelum ascendit, ibique residet, quoad extremo die ad judicandos homines reversurus sit.

§ 1.—*SOURCE.*

Composed by the English Reformers, 1552–3.

§ 2.—*OBJECT.*

This Article is supplementary to the Second and Third, affirming the true and proper Manhood of our risen and ascended Lord, and thus excluding the theories of certain sectaries of the Reformation period who inclined to the Docetic heresy; *e.g.*, Caspar Schwenkfeld, a Silesian nobleman (1528), contended that the flesh of Christ had never been the flesh of a created being, and is now, since the Ascension, so deified as to retain no semblance of humanity.

§ 3.—*EXPOSITION.*

(1.) The Resurrection of Christ.

Christ did truly rise again from death.

See S. Matt. xxviii. 6; Acts x. 40, 41; 1 Cor. xv. 1–20.

and took again His body, with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of Man's nature.

See S. Luke xxiv. 39, 40; S. John xx. 27. The Lord's Body after the Resurrection was the identical Body in which He suffered, but in some measure spiritualised (S. John xx. 19–27).

The Resurrection is represented as God the Father's testimony to the claim of Jesus. He had been condemned by the Sanhedrin because of His claim to be the Son of God (S. Matt. xxvi. 63–66). The Resurrection was the Divine vindication of this claim (Rom. i. 4; Acts xiii. 33). The chief work of the Apostles was to bear witness to its literal truth as an historical fact (Acts i. 22; ii. 32; iv. 33); thus it occupies the central position in Apostolic preaching (Acts ii. 32; x. 40; xiii. 30; xvii. 18), and is set forth as the very basis of our Religion (1 Cor. xv. 14–17). It must be admitted on all hands that Christianity would never have become the Religion it is without belief in the Resurrection of Christ.[1] We put a vital question, therefore, when we ask, "Is the belief in the Resurrection well grounded?"

(*a*) It is sometimes urged that the age was a superstitious, a credulous one; that the Apostles would readily imagine that they saw their Master, and would believe that He had risen. But the Evangelists seem to take special pains to make it clear that the followers of Christ were by no means prepared for His Resurrection, nor were they at first even willing to believe it; on the other hand, it was quite a difficult matter to convince them of its truth. (See S. Matt. xxviii. 17; S. Mark xvi. 11, 13, 14; S. Luke xxiv. 11, 41; and note especially the case of S. Thomas, S. John xx. 24–29). Further, it is scarcely credible that the five hundred brethren who saw the risen Lord at once (1 Cor. xv. 6) could have been the victims of illusion.

(*b*) It is said, again, that Christ, after His Resurrection, appeared only to friends (Acts x. 41), and that this makes us suspect collusion. But the testimony of the enemies of Christ to the Resurrection should not be overlooked (S. Matt. xxviii. 11–15); neither should we forget that on one memorable occasion Christ did appear to an enemy, viz., to Saul the persecutor (Acts ix. 3 *et seqq.*, xxii. 14; 1 Cor.

[1] Thus Strauss admits that "Christianity in the form in which Paul, in which all the Apostles understood it, as is presupposed in the Confessions of all Christian Churches, falls with the resurrection of Jesus." (See Oosterzee, "Christian Dogmatics," p. 565). Again, the Rev. C. J. H. Fletcher of Oxford, in a sermon the main purpose of which seems to be to proclaim the "failure" of the historical evidence of the Resurrection, has the following passage:— "Would the disciples have rallied from the shock of their Master's unexpected death without a supernatural reassertion of His life? Could they have been transformed into enthusiastic death-defying Apostles unless they had believed they had seen their risen Lord? No" ("The Taking Away of the Veil," p. 15).

xv. 8), and the fact that when He did appear to an enemy, that enemy became a friend, an Apostle, a martyr, is surely strong testimony to the fact of the Resurrection.

(*c*) There are yet other theories which see the real and profound cause of faith in Christ's corporeal Resurrection in the ineffaceable impression which His religious grandeur had left on the minds of His faithful followers,[1] and which hold that the story of the Resurrection is a parable of the immortality of the influence of Christ, and typical of the spiritual death and resurrection of humanity.[2] But any such substitution of the abiding influence of the life of Christ, or the onward progress of mankind, for the literal fact that "Christ did truly rise from death," would render many undisputed facts of history unaccountable,[3] and reduce Christianity itself to the impossible position of an effect without a cause. The evidence, indeed, is such that a great scholar, himself born and brought up in the Jewish Religion, was constrained to say, "The Resurrection may be unhesitatingly pronounced the best-established fact in history."[4]

(2.) The Ascension of Christ.

wherewith He ascended into Heaven.

We have three accounts of the Ascension in the New Testament: S. Mark xvi. 19; S. Luke xxiv. 50, 51; Acts i. 9; *cf.* also 1 S. Peter iii. 22. S. Stephen, when arraigned before the Council, saw our Lord in Heaven at the right hand of the Father (Acts vii. 56).

and there sitteth (Ps. cx. 1). The word conveys two ideas—

(*a*) That of dwelling, abiding, in glory at the right hand of God (Heb. x. 12, "for ever sat down").

(*b*) That of reigning, sitting enthroned, sharing the Father's royal power (Eph. i. 20–22).

[1] Réville, "History of the Dogma of the Deity of Jesus Christ," Chap. ii.

[2] Strauss, at the conclusion of his "Leben Jesu" (first edition), writes:— "Humanity it is that dies, and rises again, and ascends to Heaven. . . . Through faith in this Christ, specially in His death and resurrection, man is justified before God."

[3] *e.g.*, The startling rise and spread of the Christian Church, the institution and observance of the Lord's Day (Acts xx. 7; 1 Cor. xvi. 2; Rev. i. 10), and the acceptance and observance of the Holy Eucharist. If that rite be only a reminder of the utter disappointment of the first disciples, how shall we explain its unceasing celebration from the earliest times? How shall we account for the manner in which it has so completely superseded the ancient sacrificial system? (See Maclear's "Evidential Value of the Holy Eucharist.")

[4] Edersheim, "Jesus the Messiah," vol. ii. p. 626 (first edition).

We must not suppose that inaction is implied in the word "sitteth." A glance at those passages where we have accounts of appearances of Christ after His Ascension will prevent misunderstanding on this point. In Acts vii. 55, 56, we read that S. Stephen "looked up stedfastly into heaven, and saw the glory of God, and Jesus *standing* on the right hand of God, and said, Behold, I see the heavens opened, and the Son of man *standing* on the right hand of God." Again, the Lord appeared to S. John in Patmos, *walking* in the midst of the golden candlesticks (Rev. ii. 1). *Cf.* also S. Mark xvi. 20, where it is said that after the Ascension the Apostles "went forth and preached everywhere, the Lord *working with them.*"

It is in the Revelation of S. John and in the Epistle to the Hebrews that the activity of the Ascended Christ is especially brought before us. In his exile for the testimony of Jesus Christ, S. John sees a vision of the Lord in glory (Rev. i. 13–20), and the very object of His appearing is, that He may send messages to the Churches of Asia. He knows the circumstances of each Church (Rev. ii. 2, 9, 13, &c.), watches over it, and over individual members of it (ii. 13); He warns, encourages, and directs. In the same book He is seen in Heaven as the Lamb that was slain, before the throne of God He bears the marks of His wounds, pleading His Sacrifice (v. 6, 9, 12, &c.). *Cf.* Rom. viii. 34, where Christ is referred to as interceding for us at the right hand of God. But it is in the Epistle to the Hebrews that the thought of Christ exercising His High Priestly Office in Heaven is most dwelt upon (see Heb. vii. 24–28; ix. 24–26).[1]

(3.) The Return of Christ.

until He return (Acts iii. 21; Heb. ix. 28).

Our Lord Himself spoke of His return to earth in glory (S. Matt. xxiv. 30; S. John xiv. 3). At His Ascension the attendant angels gave a promise to the wondering disciples that He should return (Acts i. 11); accordingly we find the Apostolic writers continually looking forward to His coming again (Phil. i. 6, 10; 1 Thess. iii. 13, iv. 16; 2 Thess. i. 7; 1 Tim. vi. 14), which is generally regarded as close at hand (1 Cor. xv. 51, 52; 1 Thess. iv. 17); but the exact time of the second Advent is

[1] It may be noted in this connection that the dress in which the Lord appears to S. John (Rev. i. 13) is that of a priest engaged in active service.

uncertain, so that it will come unexpectedly upon those who are not constantly watching (1 Thess. v. 2, 3; 2 S. Peter iii. 10; Rev. iii. 3; *cf.* our Lord's words in S. Matt. xxiv. 36–44, xxv. 13; S. Luke xii. 35–40).

(4.) The Last Judgment.

to judge all men at the last day.

Judgment is the issue of Christ's second coming (S. Matt. xvi. 27; 2 Tim. iv. 1). Three points are clearly brought out in Holy Scripture in this connection:—

(*a*) Christ Himself is to be the Judge (S. John v. 22, 27; Acts x. 42, xvii. 31; Rom. ii. 16).

(*b*) All men are to be judged (Rom. xiv. 10; 2 Cor. v. 10; Heb. ix. 27; 1 S. Peter iv. 5), both quick and dead.

(*c*) The works done in the body form the ground of judgment (S. Matt. xvi. 27; Rom. ii. 5, 6; Rev. xx. 12, xxii. 12).

It should be noted that in this last clause of the Article there is implied the truth of a resurrection and a future state for man.

ARTICLE V

OF THE HOLY GHOST.

The Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son, is of one substance, majesty, and glory, with the Father and the Son, very and eternal God.

DE SPIRITU SANCTO.

Spiritus Sanctus, a Patre et Filio procedens, ejusdem est cum Patre et Filio essentiae, majestatis, et gloriae, verus, ac aeternus Deus.

§ 1.—*SOURCE.*

This was one of the new Articles added in 1563. It is found, word for word, in the third Article of the Wurtemburg Confession, from which it was no doubt derived.

§ 2.—*OBJECT.*

This Article seems to have been added to make the dogmatic statements of the Church against the Arians more complete.[1] Considerable danger, we know, threatened the Church from this quarter in the earlier years of Elizabeth's reign. See, *e.g.*, a letter of Archbishop Parker in which he says, "They say that the realm is full of Anabaptists, Arians, Libertines, Free-will men, &c., against whom only I thought ministers should have needed to fight in unity of doctrine" (*Parker's Correspondence*, p. 61).

§ 3.—*EXPOSITION.*

(1.) The Twofold Procession of the Holy Spirit.

The Holy Ghost proceeding from the Father and the Son.

The title "Holy Spirit" is used by our Lord Himself of "the Comforter" Whom the Father would send (S. John xiv. 26), and is also found twice in the New Testament in the mouth of an angel from heaven (S. Matt. i. 20; S. Luke i. 35), in each instance with reference to the Incarnation.

[1] That at the Reformation period some denied the Divinity of the Holy Ghost appears from Ridley's letter, quoted pp. 23, 24.

That the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father is clear from the words of our Lord in S. John xiv. 16, xv. 26, and elsewhere. For the Procession from the Son we may refer to S. John xvi. 7; Acts xvi. 7;[1] Rom. viii. 9; Phil. i. 19; 1 S. Peter i. 11; see also S. John xx. 22, where the Holy Spirit is bestowed by the Son upon the Apostles.

The Creed of the Council of Nicæa (A.D. 325) simply said, "I believe in the Holy Ghost." The Council of Constantinople (A.D. 381) added the words, "the Lord and the Life-giver, Who proceedeth from the Father, Who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified, Who spake by the prophets." The Western Church has further added the famous *Filioque clause*, which is traceable as far back as the Council of Toledo (A.D. 589), but did not win general acceptance in the Latin Church until the middle of the ninth century, when, during the Pontificate of Nicholas I., it was adopted at Rome. The controversy upon this ended, in the eleventh century, in the schism between East and West, not yet healed.[2] While we hold that the word *Filioque* expresses a Scriptural truth, at the same time we are bound to admit that its insertion in the Nicene Creed, without Œcumenical authority, is on no ground justifiable.

(2.) The Divinity of the Holy Spirit.

The Holy Ghost . . . is of one substance, majesty, and glory, with the Father and the Son, very and eternal God.

The true and proper Divinity of the Holy Spirit is indicated by the fact that Divine homage is rendered to Him in the formula of Baptism (S. Matt. xxviii. 19) and in S. Paul's Benediction in 2 Cor. xiii. 14. There are not wanting, moreover, passages in Holy Scripture which directly testify to His Godhead; see especially 1 Cor. iii. 16, 17; Acts v. 3, 4.

[1] In this passage the correct reading is Τὸ Πνεῦμα Ἰησοῦ; so Revised Version following the oldest extant MSS., ℵABCDE.; and Vulgate, "Spiritus Jesu."

[2] With regard to the Procession of the Holy Spirit, the *Orthodox Confession* of the Greek Church speaks thus, διδάσκει (scil. ἐκκλησία) πῶς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐκπορεύεται ἐκ μόνου τοῦ πατρὸς ὡς πηγῆς καὶ ἀρχῆς τῆς θεότητος.

ARTICLE VI

OF THE SUFFICIENCY OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES FOR SALVATION.

Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation. In the name of Holy Scripture we do understand those Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church.

DE DIVINIS SCRIPTURIS QUOD SUFFICIANT AD SALUTEM.

Scriptura Sacra continet omnia quae ad salutem sunt necessaria, ita ut quicquid in ea nec legitur, neque inde probari potest, non sit a quoquam exigendum, ut tanquam articulus fidei credatur, aut ad salutis necessitatem requiri putetur. **Sacrae Scripturae nomine eos Canonicos libros Veteris et Novi Testamenti intelligimus, de quorum auctoritate in Ecclesia nunquam dubitatum est**

Of the Names and Number of the Canonical Books.

Genesis.
Exodus.
Leviticus.
Numbers.
Deuteronomy.
Joshua.
Judges.
Ruth.
The First Book of Samuel.
The Second Book of Samuel.
The First Book of Kings.
The Second Book of Kings.
The First Book of Chronicles.
The Second Book of Chronicles.
The First Book of Esdras.
The Second Book of Esdras.
The Book of Esther.
The Book of Job.
The Psalms.
The Proverbs.
Ecclesiastes, or Preacher.
Cantica, or Songs of Solomon.
Four Prophets the greater.
Twelve Prophets the less.

And the other Books (as Hierome saith) the Church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners: but yet it doth not apply them to establish any doctrine. Such are these following:—

Alios autem libros (ut ait Hieronymus) legit quidem Ecclesia ad exempla vitae et formandos mores, illos tamen ad dogmata confirmanda non adhibet: ut sunt:—

The Third Book of Esdras.
The Fourth Book of Esdras.
The Book of Tobias.
The Book of Judith.
The rest of the Book of Esther.
The Book of Wisdom.
Jesus the Son of Sirach.

Baruch the Prophet.
The Song of the Three Children.
The Story of Susanna.
Of Bel and the Dragon.
The Prayer of Manasses.
The First Book of Maccabees.
The Second Book of Maccabees.

All the Books of the New Testament, as they are commonly received, we do receive and account them Canonical.

Novi Testamenti omnes libros (ut vulgo recepti sunt) recipimus et habemus pro Canonicis.

§ 1.—*SOURCE.*

As it stood in the XLII. Articles of 1553 this Article commenced as follows:—

> "Holie Scripture conteineth all things necessary to Salvation: So that whatsoever is neither read therein, nor may be proved thereby, although it be sometime receiued of the faithful, as godlie, and profitable for an ordre and comelinesse: yeat no manne ought to bee constreigned to believe it, as an article of faith, or repute it requisite to the necessitie of Saluation."

The wording was altered to its present form in 1563, and at the same time the clause in **thick type** was added from the Article "De Sacra Scriptura" in the Wurtemburg Confession.

§ 2.—*OBJECT.*

(*a*) This Article enunciates the great principle which underlay the Reformation,[1] the sufficiency of Holy Scripture as

[1] With the statement of our Article we may compare the following:—

TETRAPOLITAN CONFESSION, Cap. I., De Materia Concionum:

> "Mandavimus iis, qui concionandi apud nos munere fungebantur, ut nihil aliud quam quae sacris literis aut continentur, aut certe nituntur, e suggestu docerent."

FRENCH CONFESSION, Art. V.:

> "Cumque haec sit omnis veritatis summa, complectens quicquid ad cultum Dei et salutem nostram requiritur, neque hominibus, neque ipsis etiam Angelis fas esse dicimus, quicquam ei verbo adjicere vel detrahere, vel quicquam prorsus in eo immutare."

SCOTCH CONFESSION, Art. XIX., Scripturarum Authoritas:

> "Credimus et confitemur Scripturas Dei sufficienter instruere, et hominem Dei perfectum reddere."

BELGIC CONFESSION, Art. VII.:

> "Credimus autem sacram hanc scripturam perfectissime omnem Dei volun-

containing all things necessary to salvation. Our Church thus repudiates scholastic errors on the subject of the "unwritten Word."[1]

(*b*) The Article also condemns the sectaries of the period who disparaged the authority of the Bible, as compared with the immediate inspiration of which they conceived themselves to be the channel.[2]

It is worthy of remark that the Helvetic Confessions and the Westminster Confession[3] put an Article on the Holy Scriptures in the first place, beginning by laying down the authority upon which they relied in their departure from the historic Church. The XXXIX. Articles follow the order of the ancient Creeds in opening with a declaration of faith in God. This latter is the logical order; we first say, "I believe in God," before we acknowledge Holy Scripture as the Word of God.

tatem complecti, et in illa abunde ea omnia doceri, quaecunque ab hominibus credi necesse est, ut salutem consequantur."

SECOND HELVETIC CONFESSION, Art. I.:

"Et in hac Scriptura sancta habet universalis Christi ecclesia plenissime exposita quaecunque pertinent, cum ad salvificam fidem, tum ad vitam Deo placentem, recte informandam. Quo nomine distincte a Deo praeceptum est, ne ei aliquid vel addatur vel detrahatur."

[1] Contrast the decree of the COUNCIL OF TRENT, Session IV. (April 1546):

"Synodus . . . perspiciensque hanc veritatem et disciplinam contineri in libris scriptis, et sine scripto traditionibus, quae ex ipsius Christi ore ab Apostolis acceptae, aut ab ipsis Apostolis, Spiritu Sancto dictante quasi per manus traditae, ad nos usque pervenerunt; orthodoxorum patrum exempla secuta, omnes libros tam Veteris quam Novi Testamenti, cum utriusque unus Deus sit auctor, nec non traditiones ipsas, tum ad fidem, tum ad mores pertinentes, tanquam vel ore tenus a Christo, vel a Spiritu Sancto dictatas, et continua successione in ecclesia catholica conservatas, pari pietate affectu ac reverentia suscipit et veneratur."

See also the ORTHODOX CONFESSION of the Greek Church, p. 18:

Φανερὸν πῶς τὰ ἄρθρα τῆς πίστεως ἔχουσι τὸ κῦρος καὶ τὴν δοκιμασίαν, μέρος ἀπὸ τὴν ἁγίαν γραφήν, μέρος ἀπὸ τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν παράδοσιν. . . . Ἤγουν δύο λογίων εἶναι τὰ δόγματα. Ἄλλα παραδίδει ἡ γραφή, τὰ ὁποῖα περιέχονται εἰς τὰ θεολογικὰ βιβλία τῆς ἁγίας γραφῆς, καὶ ἄλλα εἶναι δόγματα παραδιδομένα ἐκ στόματος ἀπὸ τοὺς ἀποστόλους, καὶ τοῦτα ἑρμηνεύθησαν ἀπὸ τὰς συνόδους καὶ τοὺς ἁγίους πατέρας, καὶ εἰς τὰ δύο τοῦτα ἡ πίστις εἶναι τεθεμελιωμένη.

[2] *Cf.* CALVIN'S INSTITUTES, I. ix. 1:

"Emerserunt nam nuper vertiginosi quidam, qui Spiritus magisterium factuosissime obtendentes, lectionem omnem ipsi respuunt, et eorum irrident simplicitatem qui emortuam et occidentem, ut ipsi vocant, literam adhuc consectantur."

[3] So also the Irish Articles of 1615. See Appendix VI.

§ 3.—*EXPOSITION.*

(1.) The Rule of Faith—Holy Scripture.

Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation.

Thus does our Church unmistakably lay down the principle that Holy Scripture contains, explicitly or implicitly, all things necessary relating both to faith and practice, beyond which God requires nothing from us (2 Tim. iii. 15–17). We may compare the words of S. Cyprian, "Unde est ista traditio? Utrumne de dominica et evangelica auctoritate descendens, an de apostolorum mandatis atque epistolis veniens? Ea enim facienda esse quae scripta sunt" (Ep. lxxiv. p. 223, ed. Goldhorn).

We should notice how, in accordance with what is here laid down, Scripture is constantly referred to as the basis of doctrine in the Articles themselves; see Articles VIII., IX., XIV., XV., XVII., XVIII., XX., XXI., XXII., XXIV., XXV., XXVIII., XXXII., XXXIV., XXXVII., XXXIX.

(2.) What is to be reckoned as Scripture, and upon what Ground is it so reckoned?

In the name of Holy Scripture we do understand those Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church.

According to the first clause of our Article, the Church's teaching must be founded on, or provable by, Holy Scripture; in the second clause, now under consideration (which was borrowed, as we have already seen, from the Wurtemburg Confession), it is asserted that what constitutes Holy Scripture is determined by the general consent of the Church. The Gospel teaching was at first oral (S. Luke i. 4), and the deposit of sound doctrine was transmitted by word of mouth in the earliest times (2 Tim. i. 13; 1 Tim. i. 10, 11; Tit. i. 9), but the consent of the Christian community as a whole soon singled out certain writings of Apostles and Apostolic men as embodying in permanent form the great truths of the Gospel for the use of the

whole Church. These books, which were thus stamped as authoritative, constitute the New Testament Canon, and are spoken of as the "Canonical Books." The word "Canon" properly signifies a rule or standard; hence "Canonical" as applied to the books of Scripture means authorised by the general consent of the Church as a standard of Divine Truth.

When it is said in the Article "of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church," we must of course understand "the Church Universal," because in some parts of the Church there was for a time a doubt concerning some of the books we account Canonical, *e.g.*, the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Epistles of SS. James and Jude, 2 and 3 S. John, and 2 S. Peter, as well as the Revelation.

In referring to the consent of the Church as determining the Canon of Scripture, the Church of England altogether parts company with those bodies which were influenced by the teaching of Zwingli, Calvin, and their school, and with which, in the reign of Edward, she had been so closely associated. The insertion of the clause from the Wurtemburg Confession is one of the many indications of a desire on the part of the authorities of the English Church in the early years of Elizabeth to return to a more Catholic position.

Contrast with our Article the following extracts from formularies of the Swiss School:—

Calvin, Institutes, I. vii. 1:

"Invaluit autem apud plerosque perniciosissimus error, Scripturae tantum inesse momenti, quantum illi Ecclesiae suffragiis conceditur; ac si vero aeterna inviolabilisque Dei veritas, hominum arbitrio niteretur."

Ibid., I. vii. 5:

"Maneat ergo hoc fixum, quos Spiritus sanctus intus docuit, solide acquiescere in Scriptura, et hanc quidem esse *αὐτόπιστον*,[1] neque demonstrationi et rationibus subjici eam fas esse; quam tamen meretur apud nos certitudinem, Spiritus testimonio consequi."

French Confession, Art. IV.:

"Hos libros agnoscimus esse Canonicos, id est, ut fidei nostrae normam et regulam habemus, idque non tantum ex communi Ecclesiae consensu, sed etiam multo magis ex testimonio et intrinseca Spiritus sancti persuasione: quo suggerente docemur, illos ab aliis libris ecclesiasticis discernere."

[1] *i.e.*, Self-authenticated.

Scotch Confession, Art. XIX.:

"Asserimus itaque quod qui dicunt Scripturas non aliam habere auctoritatem, sed eam quam ab Ecclesia accepit, sunt in Deum blasphemi, et verae Ecclesiae injuriam faciunt."

Belgic Confession, Art. V.:

"Hosce libros solos recipimus tanquam sacros et Canonicos, quibus fides nostra inniti, confirmari, et stabiliri possit. Et credimus absque ulla dubitatione ea omnia, quae in illis continentur, idque non tam quod Ecclesia illos pro Canonicis recipiat et comprobet, quam quod Spiritus Sanctus nostris conscientiis testetur illos a Deo emanasse: et eo maxime quod ipsi etiam per se sacram hanc suam auctoritatem et sanctitatem testentur atque comprobent."

Second Helvetic Confession, Art. I.:

"Credimus et confitemur Scripturas canonicas sanctorum prophetarum et apostolorum utriusque Testamenti, ipsum verum esse verbum Dei; et auctoritatem sufficientem ex semetipsis non ex hominibus habere. Nam Deus ipse loquutus est patribus, prophetis et Apostolis, et loquitur adhuc nobis per Scripturas sanctas."

The Westminster Divines, in their revision of the Article, omitted altogether the clause referring to the general consent of the Church,[1] and gave expression to their own views in the

Westminster Confession, Art. I. § iv.:

"The authority of the Holy Scripture for which it ought to be believed and obeyed, dependeth not upon the testimony of any man or Church, but wholly upon God (Who is truth itself), the author thereof; and therefore it is to be received, because it is the word of God."

(3.) Estimation of the Apocrypha.[2]

And the other books (as Hierome saith) the Church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners: but yet it doth not apply them to establish any doctrine.

The Apocryphal Books (commonly so called) are not classed with the Canonical Books, because they do not stand the test laid down, viz., acceptance by the general consent of the Church. At the same time it is distinctly affirmed that these books have a value of their own. The Council

[1] See Appendix IV.

[2] The precise signification of the title *Apocrypha* is uncertain. The Greek word literally means "hidden." The books in question may have been so called (*a*) on account of the obscurity of their origin, or (*b*) because they were relegated by the Church to comparative obscurity.

of Trent in a decree of the Fourth Session (April 1546) places Tobias, Judith, Baruch, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, and 1 and 2 Maccabees in the Old Testament Canon. The Apocryphal Books were not formally included in the Canon of Scripture by the Eastern Church until 1692. The value set upon the Apocrypha by the English Church may be gathered from the following facts:—

(*a*) The *Benedicite* from the Apocrypha is appointed as a Canticle for use at Morning Prayer.

(*b*) *Lessons* are appointed from the Apocrypha at Morning and Evening Prayer. See the Prayer Book Calendar, October 27–November 18, Holy Innocents Day, and the feasts of S. Luke and All Saints.

(*c*) Two of the *Offertory Sentences* in the Communion Service are taken from the Book of Tobit.

(*d*) In the *Homilies* the Apocrypha is very often quoted, and is even spoken of as the Word of God, *e.g.*:—

> "And Almighty God by the Wise man saith, That man which sweareth much shall be full of sin, and the scourge of God shall not depart from his house."—Ecclus. xxiii. 11.
>
> (Against Swearing, p. 75.)

> "The invention of them was the beginning of spiritual fornication, as the Word of God testifieth, Sap. xiv."—Wisdom xiv. 12.
>
> (Against peril of Idolatry, p. 258.)

> "The same lesson doth the Holy Ghost also teach in sundry places of the Scripture, saying, Mercifulness and almsgiving purgeth from all sins," &c.—Tobit iv. 10.
>
> (Of Almsdeeds, p. 414.)

> "Let us learn also here (Wisdom vi. 1–3) by the infallible and undeceivable Word of God." (Of Obedience, p. 111.)

Other examples may be seen on pp. 103, 119, 189, ed. S.P.C.K.

The passage of S. Jerome to which reference is made in the Article occurs in the Preface to the Books of Solomon:—

> "Sicut ergo Judith et Tobiae, et Machabæorum legit quidem Ecclesia, sed eos inter canonicas Scripturas non recipit; sic et haec duo volumina legat ad aedificationem plebis, non ad auctoritatem ecclesiasticorum dogmatum confirmandam."

ARTICLE VII

OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

The Old Testament is not contrary to the New, for both in the Old and New Testament everlasting life is offered to Mankind by Christ, Who is the only Mediator between God and Man, being both God and Man.

Wherefore they are not to be heard, which feign that the old Fathers did look only for transitory promises.

Although the Law given from God by Moses, as touching Ceremonies and Rites, do not bind Christian men, nor the civil precepts thereof ought of necessity to be received in any commonwealth: yet notwithstanding, no Christian man whatsoever is free from the obedience of the Commandments which are called Moral.

DE VETERI TESTAMENTO.

Testamentum Vetus Novo contrarium non est, quandoquidem tam in veteri quam in novo, per Christum, qui unicus est Mediator Dei et hominum, Deus et homo, aeterna vita humano generi est proposita.

Quare male sentiunt, qui veteres tantum in promissiones temporarias sperasse confingunt.

Quanquam lex a Deo data per Mosen, quoad Ceremonias et Ritus, Christianos non astringat, neque civilia ejus praecepta in aliqua republica necessario recipi debeant: nihilominus tamen ab obedientia mandatorum, quae moralia vocantur, nullus (quantumvis Christianus) est solutus.

§ 1.—*SOURCE.*

We owe the form of this Article to the English Reformers. The latter part, printed in **thick type** in the Latin Version, was added in 1563, being taken from the 19th of the XLII. Articles of 1553.

§ 2.—*OBJECT.*

The Article is directed against Anabaptist opinions concerning the Old Testament, which were rife at the Reformation period. See "Reformatio Legum," De Haeresibus, c. 4:—

> "Multi nostris temporibus inveniuntur, inter quos Anabaptistae praecipue sunt collocandi, ad quos si quis Vetus Testamentum

alleget, illud pro abrogato jam et obsoleto penitus habent, omnia quae in illo posita sunt ad prisca majorum nostrorum tempora referentes. Itaque nihil eorum ad nos statuunt pervenire debere."

Some (*e.g.*, Servetus and his followers) denied the vital connection of Judaism with Christianity,[1] and maintained that the Old Testament saints had no hope of life beyond the present. *Cf.* Calvin, "Institutes," II. x. 1 :—

> "Quinetiam quod utilissimum alioqui futurum erat, necessarium nobis fecerunt prodigiosus nebulo Servetus ac furiosi nonnulli ex Anabaptistarum secta, qui non aliter de Israelitico populo sentiunt quam de aliquo porcorum grege, utpote quem nugantur a Domino in hac terra saginatum, citra spem ullam cœlestis immortalitatis."

The latter part of the Article excludes the Antinomianism prevalent amongst the sectaries of the time, as is shown by the words which followed when the latter half of our present Article stood as a separate Article :—

> "Wherfore thei are not to be harkened unto, who affirme that holie Scripture is geuen onlie to the weake, and do boaste theimselues continually of the spirit, of whom (thei sai) thei haue learned soche things as thei teache, although the same be most euidently repugnaunt to the holie Scripture."—Art. XIX., 1553.

§ 3.—*EXPOSITION.*

(1.) The Unity and Vital Connection of the Old and New Testament.

The Old Testament is not contrary to the New, for both in the Old and New Testament everlasting life is offered to Mankind by Christ.

Our Lord Himself declared that He came, not to destroy, but to fulfil the Law (S. Matt. v. 17, 18); the Old Testament does not, therefore, stand to the New in the relation of an opposed dispensation, but in that of a preparation. The Law pointed forward and led up to Christ and His Dispensation (Gal. iii. 24; Acts x. 43; Rom. iii. 21), its ordinances, sacrifices, &c., deriving their spiritual efficacy

[1] It will be remembered that the Old Testament was set in opposition to the New by the Gnostic heretics of the second century, being ascribed to a being inferior, or even hostile, to the Supreme Deity. The Old Testament was thus regarded, *e.g.*, by Saturninus, Basilides, and Marcion, and by such sects as the Cainites and Ophites.

from the Sacrifice of Christ, His death redeeming the transgressions of those who lived under the Old Dispensation (Heb. ix. 1–15; x. 1–14). The prophets spoke beforehand of His Kingdom, His Work and Sufferings (S. Luke xxiv. 27, 44; S. John v. 39, 46; Acts xviii. 28, xxvi. 22, xxviii. 23), and the promises given through the inspired writers of the Old Testament have reference not merely to temporal welfare, but spiritual and eternal blessings are promised to men, and in both Old and New Testament alike are connected with the work of the Messiah (**per Christum**); see, *e.g.*, Job xix. 25–27; Ps. xvi. 8–11; Isa. xxvi. 19.

We might exhibit the unity of the Old and New Testament under two main heads:—

(*a*) *Unity of doctrine* runs through both. Both proceed from the One God (Heb. i. 1, 2); both tell of His Unity and Personality, His government of the world, His holiness, His choice of certain to be in a special relation with Himself.

(*b*) *Testimony to Christ.* Both tell of Him, the Old Testament being typical in character, its rites, ordinances, and even its history, pointing onward to Him. It is in the Epistle to the Hebrews especially that this aspect of the Old Testament is enlarged upon.

Who is the only Mediator between God and Man, being both God and Man.

Moses is called a mediator (Gal. iii. 19), as being the agent through whom the Law was given to the tribes of Israel. He represented the people to God, and was divinely commissioned as a servant (Heb. iii. 5) to represent God to the people. The Incarnate Son of God, being perfect man, is qualified to represent human nature in its perfection before God, and at the same time, being very God, to represent God to man in an infinitely higher and fuller manner than it was possible for the servant to do. Thus, in Christ, God and the human race are brought together in a wonderful and transcendent way, and by virtue of union with Him mankind is brought into such near relation with God as would not be possible without His mediating work. He has wrought the Atonement which none other could effect, and is therefore the only Mediator between God and Man.

Wherefore they are not to be heard which feign that the old Fathers did look only for transitory promises.

That holy men of old understood the spiritual and eternal significance of the promises made to them under the Old Dispensation is distinctly asserted by our Lord Himself (S. John viii. 56) and by the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews (Heb. xi. 10, 14, 26).

Our Church thus insists on the great value of the Old Testament Scriptures (*cf.* Rom. xv. 4), and especially shows her sense of their value by appointing Lessons from the Old Testament to be read daily at Morning and Evening Prayer, side by side with the New Testament. But it must not be inferred from this that the two are exactly on a level. Christ is τέλος νόμου (Rom. x. 4); *i.e.*—

(*a*) To Christ the Law pointed forward, so that there is a vital connection between the Law and the Gospel.

(*b*) With Christ the Law ended, so that the Law and the Gospel are not on the same level for Christians (Rom. vi. 14).

(2.) The Force which the Precepts of the Mosaic Law have for Christians.

The precepts of the Law are treated in the Article under three heads; it is stated that—

(*a*) *Ceremonial Laws* **do not bind Christian men.**

(*b*) *Civil precepts* **ought not of necessity to be received in any commonwealth.**

See Jer. xxxi. 31, 32; Acts xv. 10, 11; Gal. v. 1; Col. ii. 16, 17; Heb. vii. 12.

But with regard to (*c*) *Moral Commandments*, it is laid down that **no Christian man whatsoever is free from the obedience of the Commandments which are called Moral.** (See especially S. Matt. v. 17–20.)[1]

The question may here be asked, How then are we to explain those passages of S. Paul which speak of the Moral Law as the occasion of sin, and represent the Christian as free from it? *Cf.* Rom. iii. 20; iv. 15; v. 20; vii. 7–13.

[1] *Cf.* Westminster Confession, Art. XIX. § v.:

"The moral law doth for ever bind all, as well justified persons as others, to the obedience thereof: and that not only in regard of the matter contained in it, but also in respect of the authority of God, the Creator, Who gave it. Neither doth Christ in the Gospel in any way dissolve, but much strengthen this obligation."

The Apostle represents the Law as—

(i.) *Intensifying the sense of sin* (Rom. vii. 13; 1 Cor. xv. 56).

God's holiness is therein set forth clearly (*cf.* Lev. xi. 45). He is righteous, loves righteousness, and demands it from man (Lev., *ibid.*). Thus the Law is *νόμος τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασι* (Eph. ii. 15); it said to man, "Thou shalt" . . . "Thou shalt not" . . . but this only made him contrast the requirements of God with his own shortcomings, and brought his sin into relief.

(ii.) *Bringing man into condemnation.*

The very prohibitions of the Law excited opposition between the flesh and the spirit (Rom. vii. 7–11); the inward man approved the Law, the conscience recognising the justice of its demands (Rom. vii. 22), but the flesh could not act up to it, and man, finding himself powerless to perform that which he knew to be good, stood condemned (Rom. vii. 18–23). The Law itself gave no help by which the spirit might overcome the flesh, and hence it is called "the ministration of condemnation" (2 Cor. iii. 9), "the ministration of death" (2 Cor. iii. 7), and "the letter that killeth" (2 Cor. iii. 6; Rom. vii. 9–11); the result was a sense of misery, and of the impossibility of fulfilling the Law (Rom. vii. 21–24).

What man needed, therefore, was pardon for the past (Acts xxvi. 18), and for the future not merely moral teaching, but power to enable him to carry out such teaching in his life. Christ has satisfied the need (Rom. vii. 23–25), bringing to man a new power—Divine grace (Rom. vi. 14)—and delivering him from his condition of helplessness under the Old Dispensation; thus it is that S. Paul speaks of Christ as having redeemed us from being under the Law (Gal. iv. 4, 5), and of Christians who are led by the Spirit as being under the Law no longer (Gal. v. 18).

At the same time the Apostle emphatically repudiates Antinomianism (Rom. vi. 15). In one sense the Law is re-established (Rom. iii. 31), no longer, however, as an external command, but as an indwelling principle. Christian obedience is not like that of a slave, but is the obedience of a son who delights to do his father's will (Rom. viii. 14–16), and, being thus a matter of grace, completely fulfils the ideal of righteousness of which the Law was

the expression (Rom. viii. 1–4). Not merely, therefore, does the outward obedience of a Christian fulfil the bare letter of the Law, but the thoughts and intents of his heart are, through the indwelling Spirit, brought into harmony with the will of God, Who gave the Law.

Thus the Law of Christ is not merely a ratification of the Moral Law, but goes far beyond it. (See especially S. Matt. v. 20–48.) Luther developed S. Paul's teaching into Antinomianism; *e.g.*, in his Commentary on Galatians he maintains that the Ten Commandments have no right to accuse or alarm the conscience wherein Christ reigns. Even the more cautious Melanchthon, too, seems to have held that the Law may not condemn the Christian although it is not fulfilled by him. Our Article is directly opposed to such dangerous teaching, and simply reaffirms the teaching of the Schoolmen, and, as we have seen, of Scripture on the subject.

ARTICLE VIII

OF THE THREE CREEDS.

The Three Creeds, Nicene Creed, Athanasius's Creed, and that which is commonly called the Apostles' Creed, ought thoroughly to be received and believed: for they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture.

DE TRIBUS SYMBOLIS.

Symbola tria, Nicænum, Athanasii, et quod vulgo Apostolorum appellatur, omnino recipienda sunt et credenda. Nam firmissimis Scripturarum testimoniis probari possunt.

§ 1.—*SOURCE.*

Composed by the English Reformers, 1552–3. We may compare the first of the X. Articles of 1536, which declares that the fundamentals of religion are—

> "Comprehended in the whole body and canon of the Bible, and also in the three Creeds or Symbols; whereof one was made by the Apostles, and is the common creed which every man useth: the second was made by the holy council of Nice, and is said daily in the Mass; and the third was made by Athanasius, and is comprehended in the Psalm 'Quicunque vult.'"

§ 2.—*OBJECT.*

To assert the Catholic character of the English Reformation the three ancient Creeds of Catholic Christendom are retained without addition or alteration. By thus accepting the three Creeds, all those heresies, whether of ancient or of modern growth, are condemned which assail the cardinal truths of the Christian Religion. The order in which the Creeds are named in the Article is not without significance. The Nicene Creed appropriately stands first as being the most ancient, and also the most universally used.

§ 3.—*EXPOSITION.*

(1.) The Three Creeds are to be Received.

The Three Creeds, Nicene Creed, Athanasius's Creed, and that which is commonly called the Apostles', ought thoroughly to be received and believed.

From the very earliest times those who were baptized were required to make public profession of their faith. The early addition to the New Testament text in Acts viii. 37[1] affords an example of a formula of this kind:—

Εἶπε δὲ ὁ Φίλιππος "Εἰ πιστεύεις ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας ἔξεστιν." Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ εἶπε, "Πιστεύω τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶναι τὸν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν."

Traces of early Creeds are also discernible in the following passages of the Epistles:—

1 Cor. viii. 6—*ἡμῖν εἷς Θεὸς ὁ πατήρ, ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα, καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν, καὶ εἷς Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα, καὶ ἡμεῖς δι' αὐτοῦ.*

1 Cor. xv. 3–5—*Παρέδωκα γὰρ ὑμῖν ἐν πρώτοις, ὃ καὶ παρέλαβον, ὅτι Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν, κατὰ τὰς γραφάς· καὶ ὅτι ἐτάφη, καὶ ὅτι ἐγήγερται τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ, κατὰ τὰς γραφάς.*

1 Tim. iii. 16—*Ὃς*[2] *ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί, ἐδικαιώθη ἐν πνεύματι, ὤφθη ἀγγέλοις, ἐκηρύχθη ἐν ἔθνεσιν, ἐπιστεύθη ἐν κόσμῳ, ἀνελήμφθη ἐν δόξῃ.*

The recently recovered Apology of Aristides (second century) contains a passage which reads like a quotation from a Christian Creed of that period, or at any rate indicates that the Apologist was familiar with some form of Creed:—

"The Christians then reckon the beginning of their religion from Jesus Christ, Who is named the Son of God Most High, and it is said that God came down from heaven, and from a Hebrew virgin took and clad Himself with flesh, and in a daughter of man there dwelt the Son of God. This Jesus, then, was born of the tribe of the Hebrews: and He had twelve disciples, in order

---

[1] The passage is not found in the MSS. ℵABC, and was probably inserted from an early form of baptismal profession.

[2] This is the reading of ℵAC, and is adopted in the Revised Version. Other MSS. give Θεὸς.

that a certain dispensation of His might be fulfilled. He was pierced by the Jews: and He died and was buried: and they say that after three days He rose and ascended into heaven."

References to statements of doctrine as being in use in Apostolic times may be seen in such passages as 1 Tim. iv. 6, vi. 20; 2 Tim. i. 13 (*ὑποτύπωσιν ἔχε ὑγιαινόντων λόγων*).

The earliest name given to the form of profession of Christian faith was *σύμβολον*[1]—*i.e.*, a sign or watchword by which believers were distinguished from those who did not accept Christianity. Such forms were at first no doubt very simple; but with the spread of the Church, the Christianising of Greek thought, and the rise of false teachers, came the necessity for precise and detailed statements of the Faith; hence our Creeds in their present form.

The Nicene Creed.

The Council of Nicæa was summoned in 325 A.D. by the Emperor Constantine, with the view of allaying the dissensions in the Church to which the heresy of Arius had given rise. Eusebius of Cæsarea presented to the Council the Confession of Faith which had been in use for very many years in the churches of Palestine:—

Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα Θεόν, Πατέρα παντοκράτορα, τὸν τῶν ἁπάντων ὁρατῶν τε καὶ ἀοράτων ποιητήν.

Καὶ εἰς ἕνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγον, Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ, Φῶς ἐκ Φωτός, Ζωὴν ἐκ Ζωῆς, Υἱὸν μονογενῆ, πρωτότοκον πάσης κτίσεως, πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ πατρὸς γεγεννημένον, δι' οὗ καὶ ἐγένετο τὰ πάντα.

Τὸν διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν σαρκωθέντα, καὶ ἐν ἀνθρώποις πολιτευσάμενον, καὶ παθόντα, καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, καὶ ἀνελθόντα πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα, καὶ ἥξοντα πάλιν ἐν δόξῃ κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς.

Πιστεύομεν καὶ εἰς ἓν Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον.

This Creed, however, seemed to the Council not to speak decidedly enough on the very point in dispute; certain clauses were therefore added by the assembled bishops,[2] under the guidance of Athanasius, in order to affirm in

[1] See the Latin Version of the Article.

[2] The bishops present at the Council of Nicæa numbered three hundred and eighteen in all, besides their attendant clergy.

unmistakable language that the Second Person in the Blessed Trinity is true God, of one essence with the Father. These clauses were :—

ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Πατρός.

ἀληθινὸν Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ.

ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρί.

At the same time an anathema was appended which ran as follows :—

Τοὺς δὲ λέγοντας, Ἦν ποτὲ ὅτε οὐκ ἦν, ἢ οὐκ ἦν πρὶν γεννηθῆναι, ἢ ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἐγένετο, ἢ ἐξ ἑτέρας ὑποστάσεως ἢ οὐσίας φάσκοντας εἶναι, ἢ κτιστὸν, ἢ τρεπτὸν, ἢ ἀλλοιωτὸν τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, τούτους ἀναθεματίζει ἡ καθολικὴ καὶ ἀποστολικὴ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκκλησία.

The Council of Constantinople (A.D. 381), at which one hundred and fifty bishops were present, added clauses treating of the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, in view of the false teaching of Macedonius. The concluding clauses were also adopted at the same time, while the anathema was omitted, and a few unimportant changes were made in the wording of the earlier part of the Creed. As supposed to have been put forth by the Council of Constantinople the Creed ran thus :—

Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν Πατέρα παντοκράτορα, ποιητὴν οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς, ὁρατῶν τε πάντων καὶ ἀοράτων.

Καὶ εἰς ἕνα Κύριον, Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ, τὸν ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς γεννηθέντα πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων, Φῶς ἐκ Φωτὸς, Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ, γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα, ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρί δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο.

Τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν κατελθόντα ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν, καὶ σαρκωθέντα ἐκ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς Παρθένου, καὶ ἐνανθρωπησάντα.

Σταυρωθέντα τε ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου, καὶ παθόντα, καὶ ταφέντα· Καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ κατὰ τὰς γραφάς· Καὶ ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, καὶ καθεζόμενον ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ πάλιν ἐρχόμενον μετὰ δόξης κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς· οὗ τῆς βασιλείας οὐκ ἔσται τέλος.

Καὶ εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον, τὸ Κύριον, καὶ τὸ

ζωοποιὸν, τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, τὸ σὺν Πατρὶ καὶ Υἱῷ συμπροσκυνούμενον καὶ συνδοξαζόμενον, τὸ λαλῆσαν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν.

Εἰς μίαν ἁγίαν καθολικὴν καὶ ἀποστολικὴν Ἐκκλησίαν.

Ὁμολογοῦμεν ἓν βάπτισμα εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν.

Προσδοκῶμεν ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν.

Καὶ ζωὴν τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος.

The form of the Nicene Creed in use in the Western Church differs from the above in that it has two additional clauses, both traceable as far back as the third Council of Toledo, A.D. 589:—

(*a*) *Deum de Deo* after *γεννηθέντα πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων.* The words added, however, do not express any truth not before contained in the Creed, being covered by the clause, *Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ.*

(*b*) *Filioque*, giving expression to the doctrine of the double procession of the Holy Spirit, and never accepted by the Eastern Church.

(See notes on Art. V. p. 45).

The Athanasian Creed.

In the rubric in the Prayer Book enjoining its use this Creed is entitled a "Confession of our Christian Faith, commonly called the Creed of Saint Athanasius." The authorship is thus not directly ascribed to him, and although we meet with the ascription of its composition to Athanasius as early as the sixth century, there is every reason for concluding that it was not composed by him, but was called Athanasian rather because it contains and enforces the great truths which that Father spent his life in defending. Internal evidence points to the period between 420 and 450 A.D. as the time of the composition of this Creed.

(*a*) Its form and style indicate that the Creed was originally drawn up by a Latin writer, and that it originated, not in the Eastern, but in the Western Church. The facts that the earliest traces of its public use are found in the Gallican Church, and that the oldest MSS. have been found in France, support this conclusion.

(*b*) The phraseology is evidently borrowed in several places from the writings of S. Augustine of Hippo. In view of

this it would be difficult to suppose that the Creed was composed much before 420 A.D.

(*c*) On the other hand, although the language of the Creed excludes Eutychianism,[1] there is no express or distinct condemnation of that heresy; we may fairly argue, therefore, that it was drawn up before the Eutychian heresy came to a head and was condemned at the Council of Chalcedon (451 A.D.), since otherwise we should expect the doctrine of the two distinct Natures in Christ to be more distinctly stated.[2]

To the question, "Who wrote this Creed?" no certain answer can be given, but scholars have associated it with the names of the following writers of note in the Western Church :—

Hilary, Bishop of Arles, 429.
Vincentius of Lerins, 434.
Vigilius of Tapsus, 484.

It should be noted that the Athanasian Creed is very different, as well in its origin as in its character, from the other two Creeds which are named with it in the Article. It did not grow out of the form of profession made by Christian converts at Baptism, nor was it drawn up by any Council; and, as the title given to it in some MSS. indicates,[3] it partakes more of the nature of a Hymn or Psalm, than of a Creed in the proper sense of the word. It does not simply lay down the outlines of the Christian Faith, but it is rather the outpouring of a devout and thoughtful soul, pondering, and with loving faith dwelling and enlarging upon, the deep mysteries of the Triune Being of God, and of the Incarnation.

The Apostles' Creed.

In its present form this Creed is not traceable further back than about the middle of the eighth century, when we meet with it in the writings of Pirminius,[4] who gives it as the form used in the Baptismal Service. Though it

[1] See v. 34 :—

"Unus omnino, non confusione Substantiae."

[2] *Cf.*, *e.g.*, v. 33 :—

"Unus autem, non conversione Divinitatis in carnem
Sed *adsumptione Humanitatis in Deum.*"

[3] "Hymnus S. Athanasii de Trinitate."

[4] Very little is known of Pirminius, but he is said to have laboured as a missionary in Germany.

does not appear till about 750 A.D. in the precise form with which we are familiar, the Creed is in reality the product of a much earlier age, having grown up in the Western Church within the first four centuries. We meet with the substance of it in the writings of Irenæus and of Tertullian.

The Creed given by Irenæus[1] (A.D. 180) as expressing the faith of the Church in Germany, Spain, the Celtic nations, the East, Libya, Egypt, and in "the central parts of the earth," runs as follows:—

Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν Πατέρα παντοκράτορα, τὸν πεποιηκότα τὸν οὐρανόν, καὶ τὴν γῆν, καὶ τὰς θαλάσσας, καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς.

Καὶ εἰς ἕνα Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὸν σαρκωθέντα ὑπὲρ τῆς ἡμετέρας σωτηρίας·

Καὶ εἰς Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον, τὸ διὰ τῶν προφητῶν κεκηρυχὸς τὰς οἰκονομίας, καὶ τὰς ἐλεύσεις,

Καὶ τὴν ἐκ Παρθένου γέννησιν, καὶ τὸ πάθος, καὶ τὴν ἔγερσιν ἐκ νεκρῶν, καὶ τὴν ἔνσαρκον εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς ἀνάληψιν τοῦ ἠγαπημένου Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν, καὶ τὴν ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν ἐν τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ Πατρὸς παρουσίαν αὐτοῦ, ἐπὶ τὸ ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα, καὶ ἀναστῆσαι πᾶσαν σάρκα πάσης ἀνθρωπότητος.

Tertullian, in his treatise "De Virginibus Velandis," gives the following Articles of Christian belief:—

"In unicum Deum Omnipotentem, Mundi conditorem; Et Filium Ejus, Jesum Christum, natum ex Virgine Maria, crucifixum sub Pontio Pilato, tertia die resuscitatum a mortuis, receptum in cœlis, sedentem nunc ad dexteram Patris, venturum judicare vivos et mortuos per carnis etiam resurrectionem."

S. Augustine, in his treatises "De Fide et Symbolo" and "Sermo ad Catechumenos," has preserved the Baptismal Creed as used in his day (the close of the fourth century). In the "De Fide et Symbolo" it is thus given:—

"Credimus in Deum Patrem Omnipotentem.

"Et in Jesum Christum, Filium Dei Patris unigenitum, Dominum nostrum, qui natus est per Spiritum Sanctum ex Virgine Maria. Sub Pontio Pilato crucifixus est, et sepultus. Tertio die resurrexit a mortuis; in

[1] Adv. Haer. III. iii. § 4.

cœlum ascendit; sedet ad dexteram Patris, inde venturus et judicaturus vivos et mortuos.

"Credimus in Spiritum Sanctum: sanctam Ecclesiam utique catholicam; remissionem peccatorum, et carnis resurrectionem."

The Creed given in the "Sermo ad Catechumenos" differs little from the above. Besides a few minor variations, the clause on the Passion is rather fuller:—

"Passus sub Pontio Pilato, crucifixus, mortuus et sepultus."

There is also an additional clause at the conclusion:—

"In vitam aeternam."

From the Commentary of Rufinus, a presbyter of Aquileia, we gather two forms of the Creed as used about the end of the fourth century in the Churches of Aquileia and Rome respectively. It is in the Aquileian Creed as given by Rufinus that we first meet with the clause "Descendit ad inferna."

About the middle of the sixth century we have a rather fuller form of the Creed which appears in sermons ascribed to Eusebius Gallicanus. The most important variations from the earlier forms given above are:—

(i.) The addition of the words "*conceptus est*":

"Conceptus est de Spiritu Sancto."

(ii.) The expansion of the clause on the Ascension:

"Sedet ad dexteram *Dei* Patris *Omnipotentis*."

(iii.) The addition of the article, "*Sanctorum communionem*."

From the foregoing sketch it appears that the Apostles' Creed has reached its present form by a gradual process, but that its main substance is traceable to the Baptismal profession of very early times. While it is post-Apostolic as regards its present form, in its contents it is truly Apostolic, summarising as it does for the use of the faithful the doctrines taught by the Apostles. We do not, therefore, inappropriately name it the Apostles', or the Apostolic, Creed. Historically there may be another reason for the application of the name. The gradual expansion of the Creed is to be traced in the Western Church, and in this part of the Church it has always been most frequently used. Rome was from an early period the leading see of the West, and often spoken of as the Apostolic See, being the only Church of Western Christendom which was considered to have been founded by an

Apostle. It would thus naturally come about that the Creed most frequently used by it should be entitled the Apostolic, or the Apostles', Creed.

(2.) The Ground of the Acceptance of the Three Creeds. **For they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture.**

This clause is added to show that, in enjoining the three Creeds upon her members to be "thoroughly received and believed" by them, our Church is acting in accordance with the principle already laid down in Article VI., that nothing is to be required "that it should be believed as an Article of the Faith" save what is read in Holy Scripture or "may be proved thereby" (see notes on Art. VI.).

The Church provides for the continual recitation of the Creeds:—

The Nicene Creed in the Communion Service.

The Athanasian Creed on certain stated Festivals and Holy Days.

The Apostles' Creed in daily Morning and Evening Prayer.

This last is also used as the Baptismal Profession of Faith, and is given in the "Order for the Visitation of the Sick" as the rule of faith by which the sick person should prove himself whether he believe as a Christian man should.

ARTICLE IX

OF ORIGINAL OR BIRTH SIN.

Original sin standeth not in the following of Adam (as the Pelagians do vainly talk) but it is the fault and corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam, whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and is of his own nature inclined to evil, so that the flesh lusteth always contrary to the spirit, and therefore in every person born into this world, it deserveth God's wrath and damnation. And this infection of nature doth remain, yea, in them that are regenerated, whereby the lust of the flesh, called in Greek *Φρόνημα σαρκὸς* (which some do expound the wisdom, some sensuality, some the affection, some the desire, of the flesh), is not subject to the law of God. And although there is no condemnation for them that believe, and are baptized, yet the Apostle doth confess, that concupiscence and lust, hath of itself the nature of sin.

DE PECCATO ORIGINALI.

Peccatum originis non est (ut fabulantur Pelagiani) in imitatione Adami situm, sed est vitium et depravatio naturae cujuslibet hominis ex Adamo naturaliter propagati, qua fit ut ab originali justitia quam longissime distet, ad malum sua natura propendeat, et caro semper adversus spiritum concupiscat: unde in unoquoque nascentium, iram Dei, atque damnationem meretur. Manet etiam in renatis haec naturae depravatio; qua fit, ut affectus carnis, Graece *Φρόνημα σαρκὸς*, (quod alii sapientiam, alii sensum, alii affectum, alii studium, carnis interpretantur) legi Dei non subjiciatur. Et quanquam renatis et credentibus nulla propter Christum est condemnatio, peccati tamen in sese rationem habere concupiscentiam fatetur Apostolus.

§ 1.—*SOURCE.*

This Article is based to a certain extent upon the second Article of the first part of the Augsburg Confession ("De Peccato Originis"), through the medium of the XIII. Articles, but none of the clauses are taken verbatim from that formulary. The expression "originalis justitia," which occurs in our Article, and

in the XIII. Articles, is not found in the Augsburg Confession. The Pelagians are mentioned by name in all three formularies, and their tenets rejected.

§ 2.—*OBJECT.*

The Article is expressly intended to exclude Pelagianism, which had been revived at the time of the Reformation by the Anabaptists.[1] In the Article as it stood in 1553 the Anabaptists were also referred to by name, "ut fabulantur Pelagiani, et hodie Anabaptistae repetunt."

§ 3.—*EXPOSITION.*

A Short Account of Pelagianism.

Pelagius[2] himself was a monk of British origin. The lax conduct of professing Christians at Rome, who excused their shortcomings upon the ground of the infirmity of human nature, is said to have been the immediate cause of his error; he assured them that, if they would, they could live perfect lives, and was led to the opposite extreme of attributing too much to unaided human nature. A Council held at Carthage (A.D. 412) condemned Cœlestius, a friend and follower of Pelagius, who had been spreading his opinions in the North African Church. The Pelagian tenets condemned by this Council were seven in number:—

(i.) That Adam was created mortal, and would have died even if he had not sinned.

(ii.) The sin of Adam injured himself only, and not the human race.

(iii.) That the Law had the same effect as the Gospel in sending men to the Kingdom of Heaven.

(iv.) That even before Christ's coming there had been sinless men.

(v.) That infants when born are in the same state as Adam before his transgression.

(vi.) That all mankind does not die in Adam, or rise in Christ.

(vii.) That unbaptized infants would have eternal life.

A brief consideration will show us that these seven propositions

[1] See Ridley's letter quoted above, pp. 23, 24.

[2] The name Pelagius is thought to be a Grecised form of his native name, Morgan.

are logically connected. Pelagius began by arguing somewhat in this way: 'We cannot imagine that God would be so foolish as to create man to keep a Law, which yet by the very constitution of his nature he cannot keep; we must therefore conclude that man can keep God's commandments if he will.' Notice here that the Fall, with its consequences, by which man lost his original power of keeping God's commandments, is entirely overlooked; we are, according to Pelagius, at birth in the same state in which Adam was before he fell. If we admit this, it follows of course that Adam's transgression hurt only himself and not the human race. But here a difficulty arises: death has passed upon all men, even upon unconscious infants—does not this fact indicate that all partake in sin? Pelagius solved the difficulty by denying the connection of death with sin: "Adam was created mortal, and would have died even if he had not sinned."

This position has now been reached:—Adam need not have sinned; we at birth are all of us in the same condition that Adam was in before the Fall; therefore no man need sin. Pelagius went further, and affirmed that he could mention many who never had sinned. Now comes the important question, "In virtue of what power were such men sinless?" Pelagius said, by the exercise of their own free-will under the guidance of God's Moral Law; *i.e.*, in order to attain perfection man needs simply to be told what to do, and he will do it; he needs no power to enable him to act up to that which his conscience approves. If Moral Teaching thus suffices for man's need, it follows that the Gospel is in reality no advance upon the Law, but both "have the same effect in sending men to the Kingdom of Heaven."

In consequence of the conclusions already arrived at, Pelagius was obliged to take the text, "As in Adam all die," in an unreal sense; he explained it as meaning, not that all die in Adam, but that all those who do die, die in Adam; in other words, all men do not sin, but if a man happen to sin, he is following the example of Adam.

Holding these opinions, Pelagius was of course obliged to give up the doctrine of the Church with regard to Baptism. If infants at birth are sinless, there can be no need of Regeneration. The custom of baptizing infants was, however, retained by him, as a ceremony of dedication to God.

The root of the evil in Pelagius' system is his totally inadequate conception of the nature of sin. With him "sin" is

only a name for an act, which, once committed, is over and done with, and leaves no effect behind; so that human nature, whether in the individual or in the race, is uninfluenced by past sins, and is in the same condition as at the creation of Adam. Universal human experience, however, gives the lie to such theorising. We know that it is by repeated acts that habits take shape, and that character is formed. The power to be righteous did, indeed, belong to our nature as originally constituted, but Pelagius was wrong in supposing that no act of man can remove that power, and in confining the need of a special grace over and above natural endowment to some only of mankind.[1]

We will now consider the Article in detail; it defines—

(1.) The Nature of Original Sin.

Original Sin standeth not in the following of Adam (as the Pelagians do vainly talk) but it is the fault and corruption of the nature. (See Rom. v. 12–19.)

When we speak of Original Sin we do not mean merely that Adam first set the example of sinning, an example which most men follow (**Peccatum originis non est in imitatione Adami situm**)—this was the theory of Pelagius; but we understand by it a **vitium et depravatio naturae.** The nature of the race as a whole is faulty and corrupted, owing to the sin of the progenitor.

Cf. what is said in the Reformatio Legum, 'De Haeresibus,' Cap. 7:

"In labe peccati ex ortu nostro contracta, quam vitium originis appellamus, primum quidem Pelagianorum, deinde etiam Anabaptistarum nobis vitandus et submovendus est error, quorum in eo consensus contra veritatem sacrarum Scripturarum est, quod peccatum originis in Adamo solo haeserit, et non ad posteros transierit, nec ullam afferat naturae nostrae perversitatem, nisi quod ex Adami delicto propositum sit peccandi noxium exemplum, quod homines ad eandem pravitatem invitat imitandam et usurpandam."

The Augsburg Confession (Part I. Art. II.) speaks of Original Sin as "morbus seu vitium originis."

[1] The account here given of Pelagian teaching has been carefully gathered from S. Augustine's treatment of the Pelagian heresy in his treatises, "De Spiritu et Littera," "De Natura et Gratia" (which is especially valuable because it contains a review of a lost work by Pelagius), and "De Gestis Pelagii" (ed. Bright; Clarendon Press).

The Belgic Confession (Art. XV.) gives this definition:—

"Est autem peccatum originis corruptio totius naturae, et vitium haereditarium, quo et ipsi infantes in matris utero polluti sunt."

A Calvinist would describe Original Sin as the "*imputation*" of Adam's guilt.[1]

Cf. Westminster Confession, VI. iii.:

"They being the root of all mankind, the guilt of this sin was imputed."

In their revision of the ninth Article the Westminster divines inserted a clause in the definition of Original Sin:—

"Together with his first sin imputed, it is the fault and corruption of the nature," &c.[2]

(2.) The Extent of Original Sin.

of every man that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam; (Ps. li. 5.)

Thus our Church emphatically excludes Pelagianism, and affirms that Adam's sin affected not himself only, but the whole human race.

Cf. Council of Trent, Session V.:

"Si quis Adae praevaricationem sibi soli et non ejus propagini asserit nocuisse, et acceptam a deo sanctitatem et justitiam, quam perdidit, sibi soli et non nobis etiam eum perdidisse, aut inquinatum illum per inobedientiae peccatum mortem et poenas corporis tantum in omne genus humanum transfudisse, non autem et peccatum, quod mors est animae: anathema sit."

A Socinian would include Jesus Christ among men born in sin; but our Lord is expressly excluded by the wording of the Article, since He was "*supernaturally engendered*" (S. Luke i. 34, 35).

[1] It should be remembered, however, that Calvin himself did not teach this. *Cf.* Institutes, II. i. 8:

"Atque ideo infantes quoque ipsi, dum suam secum damnationem afferant, non alieno, sed suo ipsorum vitio sunt obstricti."

He thus defines Original Sin:

"Videtur ergo peccatum originale, haereditaria naturae nostrae pravitas et corruptio in omnes animae partes diffusa, quae primum facit reos irae Dei, tum etiam opera in nobis profert, quae Scriptura vocat opera carnis."

[2] The text of the Article as revised is given in full in Appendix IV.

(3.) The Result of Original Sin.

whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and is of his own nature inclined to evil, so that the flesh lusteth always contrary to the spirit;

The consequence of the Fall is here represented as twofold:—

(*a*) A *Privation*, the loss of that life of intimate communion with God which man had before the Fall, with a wide departure from original righteousness[1] (Rom. vii. 18).

(*b*) A *Depravation*, the introduction of an element of discord within man himself, the inclination of his nature to evil, so that the lower within him strives against the higher (Gen. viii. 21; Gal. v. 17).

The Saxon Confession, like the English Article, sets forth the twofold result of the Fall:—

(*a*) "Carentia originalis justitiae."
(*b*) Depravatio "quae lapsum secuta est." (Art. II.)

While Pelagianism denies that there is any result at all, so far as the human race as a whole is concerned, Calvinism, on the other hand, lays such stress on the consequences of the Fall as to hold that every spark of original righteousness has been extinguished, and the image of God not merely defaced, but utterly blotted out.[2]

French Confession, Art. IX.:

. . . "adeo ut ipsius natura sit prorsus corrupta, et spiritu excaecatus, ac corde depravatus, omnem illam integritatem, sine ulla prorsus exceptione, amiserit. Etsi enim nonnullam habet boni et mali discretionem: affirmamus tamen quicquid habet lucis mox fieri tenebras, cum de quaerendo Deo agitur, adeo ut sua intelligentia et ratione nullo modo possit ad eum accedere."

Scotch Confession, Art. III.:

"Qua transgressione, quae vulgo dicitur originale peccatum, prorsus deformata est illa Dei in homine imago."

[1] The expression "original righteousness" is taken from the XIII. Articles, but does not occur in the Augsburg Confession. The phrase was used by the Saxon school of Reformers to signify the sinless state of man before the Fall; we meet with it in the Saxon Confession, and in the definition of Original Sin given by the Formula of Concord:—

. . . "est privatio concreatae in paradiso justitiae originalis seu imaginis dei, ad quam homo initio in veritate, sanctitate atque justitia creatus fuerat."

[2] In the Institutes (Book II.) Calvin himself speaks of the heavenly image as 'obliterated' by the Fall, both in Adam and in all his posterity.

Westminster Confession, VI. 2:

"By this sin they (*i.e.*, our first parents) fell from their original righteousness and communion with God, and so became dead in sin, and wholly defiled in all the faculties and parts of soul and body."

It is evident that the wording of our Article was not strong enough to suit the Westminster divines; in their revision they altered it thus:—

"Whereby man is wholly deprived of original righteousness, and is of his own nature inclined only to evil."[1]

(4.) The Punishment due to Original Sin.

and therefore, in every person born into this world, it deserveth God's wrath and damnation. (Eph. ii. 3; Rom. v. 18.)

Pelagius and his followers denied that any penalty of Adam's transgression passes on to his offspring.

In formularies both of the Saxon and Swiss school the penalty attaching to Original Sin is spoken of as 'eternal death'; see, *e.g.*:—

Augsburg Confession, Part I. Art. II.:

"Docent . . . quod hic morbus, seu vitium originis, vere sit peccatum, damnans et afferens nunc quoque aeternam mortem his, qui non renascuntur per baptismum et Spiritum Sanctum."

Second Helvetic Confession, Art. VIII.:

. . . "merito nostro, irae Dei obnoxii, poenis subjicimur justis: adeoque a Deo abjecti essemus omnes, nisi reduxisset nos Christus liberator. Per mortem itaque intelligimus non tantum corpoream mortem, quae omnibus nobis semel, propter peccata, est obeunda, sed etiam supplicia sempiterna peccatis et corruptioni nostrae debita."

(5.) The Effect of Baptism.

And this infection of nature doth remain, yea, in them that are regenerated; whereby the lust of the flesh, called in Greek *Φρόνημα σαρκὸς* **. . . is not subject to the law of God. And although there is no condemnation for them that believe and are baptized, yet the Apostle doth confess that concupiscence and lust hath of itself the nature of sin.**

Baptism removes all condemnation on account of Original Sin (Rom. viii. 1), but does not remove the effects of the

[1] See Appendix IV.

Fall upon our nature (Gal. v. 17), so that there remains, even in the regenerate, the lusting of the flesh against the spirit (Rom. viii. 7), and this 'concupiscentia' has of itself the nature of sin (Rom. vii. 7).

Cf. what is said in the sixth of the XIII. Articles:—

"Quia vero infantes nascuntur cum peccato originis, habent opus remissione illius peccati, et illud ita remittitur ut reatus tollatur, licet corruptio naturae seu concupiscentia manet in hac vita, etsi incipit sanari, quia Spiritus Sanctus in ipsis etiam infantibus est efficax, et eos mundat."

To the same effect also Calvin writes in INSTITUTES, IV. XV. 11:—

"Baptismus quidem promittit nobis submersum esse nostrum Pharaonem, et peccati mortificationem; non tamen ita ut amplius non sit, aut nobis negotium non facessat; sed tantum ne superet. Nam quamdiu in hoc carcere corporis nostri clausi degemus, habitabunt in nobis reliquiae peccati; sed si promissionem in Baptismo nobis a Deo datam, fide tenemus, non dominabuntur nec regnabunt."

Melanchthon, in LOCI THEOLOGICI (p. 112), thus states the effect of Baptism:—

"Ideo sic respondemus, in baptismo tolli peccatum, quod ad reatum, seu imputationem attinet, sed manere morbum ipsum."

Bonner's words in "Profitable and Necessary Doctrine" well express the teaching of our Church:—

"Albeit baptisme be of this great efficacye, yet ye shall vnderstand that there remaineth in us that be baptized a certayne infirmitie, or inclination to synne, called concupiscence, whyche by lustes and desyres doth moue vs many tymes to synnes and wickednes; neuertheless almyghty God of his great mercy and goodnes hath geuen vs such grace in his holye sacrament of baptysme, that such carnall and fleshly lustes and desyres shall not, ne can in any wyse hurte vs, excepte we do first consent unto them."

When we come to the question whether the concupiscence which remains in the baptized is itself properly sin, we find great divergence in the formularies of the Reformation period. Those drawn up by the theologians of the

Lutheran and 'Reformed' bodies agree in affirming that such concupiscence is truly and properly sin; see, *e.g.*:—

Saxon Confession, Art. II.:

"Hanc malam concupiscentiam dicimus esse peccatum."

French Confession, Art. XI.:

"Affirmamus quoque hoc vitium, etiam post baptismum, esse vere peccatum."

Westminster Confession, VI. 5:

"Both itself, and all the motions thereof, are truly and properly sin."[1]

The Council of Trent, on the other hand, declared that the concupiscence remaining in the baptized is not properly sin. The decree of the Council upon this subject (Session V.) runs as follows:—

"Si quis per Jesu Christi gratiam, quae in baptismo confertur, reatum originalis peccati remitti negat, aut etiam asserit non tolli totum id, quod veram et propriam peccati rationem habet, sed illud dicit tantum radi aut non imputari, anathema sit, in renatis enim nihil odit Deus. . . . Manere autem in baptizatis concupiscentiam vel fomitem, sancta synodus fatetur et sentit, quae cum ad agonem relicta sit, nocere non consentientibus, sed utiliter per Christi gratiam repugnantibus non valet. Hanc concupiscentiam, quam aliquando Apostolus peccatum appellat, sancta synodus declarat, ecclesiam catholicam nunquam intellexisse peccatum appellari, quod vere et proprie in renatis peccatum sit, sed quia ex peccato est, et ad peccatum inclinat."

It will be observed that our Article speaks guardedly; while it differs from the decree of Trent in declaring that the concupiscence which remains in the baptized "has the nature of sin" (peccati in sese rationem habet[2]), yet it does not go so far as to affirm, with the other Confessions above quoted, that it is truly and properly sin.

§ 4.—*NOTEWORTHY EXPRESSIONS IN THIS ARTICLE.*

(i.) Φρόνημα σαρκὸς (Rom. viii. 6).

The key to the true meaning of φρόνημα in this phrase is to be found in the use of the cognate verb in the New Testament. *Cf.* the following passages:—

[1] *Cf.* the text of our Art. IX. as revised by the Westminster assembly of divines, Appendix IV.

[2] See the use of the same Latin phrase in Art. XIII.

Ὕπαγε ὀπίσω μου, Σατανᾶ . . . ὅτι οὐ φρονεῖς τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀλλὰ τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων (S. Matt. xvi. 23).

Οἱ γὰρ κατὰ σάρκα ὄντες τὰ τῆς σαρκὸς φρονοῦσιν (Rom. viii. 5).

Μὴ τὰ ὑψηλὰ φρονοῦντες (Rom. xii. 16).

Οἱ τὰ ἐπίγεια φρονοῦντες (Phil. iii. 19).

Τὰ ἄνω φρονεῖτε, μὴ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς (Col. iii. 2).

In the light of these passages we understand φρόνημα σαρκὸς to signify the directing of the thoughts and energies to the interests of the flesh.

(ii.) An incidental use of language in the Article is doctrinally important, and should not be overlooked. The way in which **renatis**, which occurs twice in the Latin version, is represented in the one case by "*them that are regenerated*," and in the other by "*them that are baptized*," implies the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration.

ARTICLE X

OF FREE-WILL.

The condition of man after the fall of Adam is such, that he cannot turn and prepare himself by his own natural strength and good works, to faith and calling upon God: wherefore we have no power to do good works pleasant and acceptable to God, without the grace of God by Christ preventing us, that we may have a good will, and working WITH us, when we have that good will.

DE LIBERO ARBITRIO.

Ea est hominis post lapsum Adae conditio, ut sese naturalibus suis viribus et bonis operibus ad fidem et invocationem Dei convertere ac praeparare non possit. Quare absque gratia Dei (quae per Christum est) nos praeveniente, ut velimus, et cooperante dum volumus, ad pietatis opera facienda, quae Deo grata sunt et accepta, nihil valemus.

§ 1.—*SOURCE.*

The first part of the Article (printed in thick type in the Latin version) was added in 1563, the words from "ut sese **naturalibus**" down to "**praeparare non possit**" being taken from the Article "De Peccato" in the Wurtemburg Confession. The Article of 1553, which forms the second part of our present Article, agrees almost verbatim with words of S. Augustine in his treatise "De Gratia et Libero Arbitrio," Cap. xvii.

The expression "working WITH us" was altered in 1571 from "working in us" of the previous English versions. This change, though slight, is significant, since it brings into prominence the fact that man is not so utterly depraved but that he is able to co-operate with God.

§ 2.—*OBJECT.*

This Article is really supplementary to the last, stating clearly the necessity of Divine grace, which was denied by the Pelagians and Anabaptists.

Cf. Reformatio Legum, 'De Haeresibus,' Cap. 7:

> "Nobis contra illos progrediendum est, qui tantum in libero arbitrio roboris et nervorum ponunt, ut eo solo sine alia speciali Christi gratia recte ab hominibus vivi posse constituant."

In the case of this Article the title scarcely corresponds to the contents. "Of the Necessity of Divine Grace" would be a more suitable heading.

§ 3.—*EXPOSITION.*

(1.) Man's Incapacity for Good since the Fall.

The condition of man after the fall of Adam is such, that he cannot turn and prepare himself by his own natural strength and good works, to faith and calling upon God.

In other words, man in his natural state is in a condition of slavery to sin (Rom. vii. 14; viii. 8. *Cf.* S. John viii. 34).

We should keep in mind the distinction in the technical language of theology between 'liberum arbitrium' and 'voluntas.' 'Liberum arbitrium' signifies the power of freely choosing. 'Voluntas' denotes an act of will, the determination of the 'liberum arbitrium' in a particular direction.

S. Augustine, whose writings had great influence with the Reformers, gives the following account of man's will. The 'liberum arbitrium' was—

(i.) At Creation a *media vis*,[1] capable of being inclined either to good or to evil, but coloured with good.

(ii.) Since the Fall it has been *captivatum*, and hence in the power of sin.

(iii.) But through the work of Christ it is now *liberatum*, so that by His grace it may be again turned in the direction of good.

Statements of other formularies of the Reformation period should be compared with the wording of our Article:—

Augsburg Confession, Art. XVIII.:

> "De libero arbitrio docent, quod humana voluntas habeat aliquam libertatem ad efficiendam civilem justitiam, et deligendas res rationi subjectas. Sed non habet vim sine Spiritu Sancto effi-

[1] See "De Spiritu et Littera," Cap. xxxiii.

ciendae justitiae Dei seu justitiae spiritualis, quia animalis homo, non percipit ea, quae sunt Spiritus Dei."

Saxon Confession, Art. V.:

"Sed homo nequaquam potest se liberare a peccato, et morte aeterna, viribus naturalibus: sed haec liberatio et conversio hominis ad Deum, et novitas spiritualis, fit per Filium Dei vivificantem nos Spiritu suo Sancto."

French Confession, Art. IX.:

"Item, quamvis voluntate sit praeditus, qua ad hoc vel illud movetur, tamen quum ea sit penitus sub peccato captiva, nullam prorsus habet ad bonum appetendum libertatem, nisi quam ex gratia et Dei dono acceperit."

Second Helvetic Confession, Art. IX.:

"Non sublatus est quidem homini intellectus, non erepta ei voluntas, et prorsus in lapidem vel truncum est commutatus: caeterum illa ita sunt immutata et imminuta in homine, ut non possint amplius quod potuerunt ante lapsum. Intellectus enim obscuratus est: voluntas vero ex libera, facta est voluntas serva."

Westminster Confession, IX. 3:

"Man, by his fall into a state of sin, hath wholly lost all ability of will to any spiritual good accompanying salvation; so as a natural man, being altogether averse from that good, and dead in sin, is not able, by his own strength, to convert himself, or to prepare himself thereunto."

The teaching of the Roman Catholic Church as laid down at the Council of Trent is as follows (Session VI., Jan. 1547):—

"Declarat synodus . . . oportere, ut unusquisque agnoscat et fateatur, quod cum omnes homines in praevaricatione Adae innocentiam perdidissent, facti immundi . . . usque adeo servi erant peccati . . . tametsi in eis liberum arbitrium minime exstinctum esset, viribus licet attenuatum et inclinatum."

Accordingly the Council anathematises those who say that the 'liberum arbitrium' is 'extinctum' and has become 'figmentum,' 'titulum sine re.'[1] The Council further lays down that free-will without grace cannot make man righteous; that there is no justification without Divine grace. The necessity of preventing grace is also strongly asserted; and they are anathematised who affirm that the free-will of man, when it has been roused and called, does not co-operate with God's grace, but is passive.

[1] Luther had affirmed at Heidelberg (1518) in one of his 'Paradoxes' that free-will after original sin 'res est de solo titulo'—a matter of name only, without any corresponding reality.

(2.) The Necessity of Divine Grace in order that Man may choose and perform that which is Good.

wherefore we have no power to do good works pleasant and acceptable to God, without the grace of God by Christ preventing us, that we may have a good will, and working with us, when we have that good will. (See 1 Cor. ii. 14; xii. 3.)

Man can neither form good resolutions apart from God's grace, nor carry them out by his own unassisted strength. There must be:—

(*a*) The grace of God "*Preventing*," *i.e.*, going before: the very first desire to turn to God must come from Him (S. John vi. 44; Acts xvi. 14; Phil. ii. 13).

(*b*) The grace of God "*Co-operating*," *i.e.*, working together with man's will, so that our better self is strengthened, but not superseded (Phil. ii. 13).

Note that the Article expressly speaks of the grace of God 'by Christ' (**quae per Christum est**). *Cf.* Phil. iv. 13.

All spiritual benefits which God confers upon men He confers through Christ alone, Whose merits extend to all men, in all ages of the world (Rev. xiii. 8).

The teaching of our Article is opposed to—

(*a*) *Pelagianism*, which said that man's condition by nature is such that he can keep God's commandments if he will, without any special Divine assistance.

Cf. Augsburg Confession, Art. XVIII.:

"Damnant Pelagianos, et alios, qui docent, quod sine Spiritu Sancto, solis naturae viribus possimus Deum super omnia diligere: item praecepta Dei facere, quoad substantiam actuum."

(*b*) *Calvinism*, according to which Divine grace, where it is really given, is irresistible, so that those who are saved are saved of necessity, their own will being superseded. (See the quotations given from Calvin in the notes on Art. XVI. § 3.)

Cf. First Baptist Confession, § 23:

"All those that have this precious faith wrought in them by the Spirit can never finally nor totally fall away."

[After Art. X., in 1553, came an Article on Grace, which was omitted in 1563. It ran thus:—

OF GRACE.

The grace of Christ, or the holie Ghost by him geuen, dothe take awaie the stonie harte, and geueth an harte of fleshe. And although those that haue no will to good thinges, he maketh them to wil, and those that would euil thinges, he maketh them not to wille the same: Yet neuerthelesse he enforceth not the wil. And therfore no man when he sinneth can excuse himself as not worthie to be blamed or condemned, by alleging that he sinned unwillinglie, or by compulsion.

DE GRATIA.

Gratia Christi, seu Spiritus Sanctus qui per eundem datur, cor lapideum aufert, et dat cor carneum. Atque licet ex nolentibus quae recta sunt, volentes faciat; et ex volentibus prava, nolentes reddat, voluntati nihilominus violentiam nullam infert. Et nemo hac de causa cum peccaverit, seipsum excusare potest, quasi nolens aut coactus peccaverit, ut eam ob causam accusari non mereatur aut damnari.]

ARTICLE XI

OF THE JUSTIFICATION OF MAN.

We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by Faith, and not for our own works or deservings. Wherefore, that we are justified by Faith only, is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort, as more largely is expressed in the Homily of Justification.

DE HOMINIS JUSTIFICATIONE.

Tantum propter meritum Domini ac Servatoris nostri Jesu Christi, per fidem, non propter opera et merita nostra, justi coram Deo reputamur. Quare sola fide nos justificari, doctrina est saluberrima, ac consolationis plenissima: ut in homilia de justificatione hominis fusius explicatur.

§ 1.—*SOURCE.*

In 1553 the Article on Justification was very brief:—

> "Justification by onely faith in Jesus Christ in that sence, as it is declared in the homelie of Justification, is a most certeine, and holesome doctrine for Christien menne."

The wording of this was slightly altered and the first part (printed in **thick type** in the Latin version) prefixed in 1563. The new part agrees with the Art. "De Justificatione" of the WURTEMBURG CONFESSION, from which it was doubtless taken:—

> "Homo enim fit Deo acceptus, et reputatur coram eo justus propter solum filium Dei Dominum nostrum Iesum Christum per fidem."

We may compare the rather fuller statement in the fifth of the much earlier English formulary, the X. ARTICLES:—

> "That sinners attain this justification by contrition and faith joined with charity, after such sort and manner as we before mentioned and declared; not as though our contrition or faith, or any works proceeding thereof, can worthily merit or deserve to attain the said justification: for the only mercy and grace of the Father, promised freely unto us for His Son's sake, Jesu Christ, and the merits of His Blood and Passion, be the only sufficient and worthy causes thereof."

§ 2.—*OBJECT.*

The Article is directed against theories of human merit so prevalent in the Mediæval Western Church, and so strongly protested against at the Reformation, especially by Luther. It may also be aimed at the tenets of the Anabaptists, whose error is thus alluded to in Archbishop Hermann's CONSULTATIO:—

> "They boste themselves to be ryghtuous and to please God, not purely and absolutely for Christes sake, but for theyr owne mortification of themselues, for theyr owne good workes and persecution, if they suffre any."

§ 3.—*EXPOSITION.*

(1.) WHAT IS MEANT BY JUSTIFICATION?

We are accounted righteous before God,

'Justification' in the writings of S. Paul signifies the entering by man (who through sin, original and actual, is by nature in a condition of alienation from God) upon a state of *δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ* (Rom. i. 17; iii. 22), *i.e.*, upon a state of righteousness which God considers as such; in other words, the entering into a right relation with God, which is the starting-point of the Christian life.

(2.) THE GROUND OF OUR JUSTIFICATION.

only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by Faith, and not for our own works or deservings:

The state of *δικαιοσύνη* before God is not attained by any efforts or merits of our own (Rom. x. 3; Phil. iii. 9); nothing that man can do of himself can bring him into right relation with God, but the reconciliation comes from God Himself, Who gave His own Son (Rom. v. 8–10, viii. 32, 33; 2 Cor. v. 21).

(*a*) *Objectively*, therefore, the ground of our justification is **the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ** (Rom. iii. 24).

It is necessary for man on his part to accept what God has done for him—he must accept the Gospel message and receive Baptism (Tit. iii. 5); this he does by faith.

(*b*) Thus, considering the matter *subjectively*, the sole requisite for entering upon a state of *δικαιοσύνη* before God is **Faith** (Rom. i. 17, iii. 22, 30, v. 1; *cf.* Acts xiii. 39, xvi. 31; Gal. v. 6; Eph. ii. 8).

On the subject of 'Justification' the following extracts should be compared with our Article:—

The COUNCIL OF TRENT understands the term 'Justification' in a wider sense than that explained above, taking it to include 'Sanctification'; thus the decree of the Council (Session VI.) differs from our Article in defining Justification as not merely the "accounting" but the "making" of us righteous:

> "Justificatio non est sola peccatorum remissio, sed et sanctificatio et renovatio interioris hominis per voluntariam susceptionem gratiae et donorum, unde homo ex injusto fit justus et ex inimico amicus, ut sit haeres secundum spem vitae aeternae . . . justitia dei, qua nos justos facit, qua videlicet ab eo donati renovamur spiritu mentis nostrae et non modo reputamur, sed vere justi nominamur et sumus, justitiam in nobis recipientes."

AUGSBURG CONFESSION, Art. IV.:

> "Item docent, quod homines non possint justificari coram Deo propriis viribus, meritis aut operibus, sed gratis justificentur propter Christum per fidem, cum credunt se in gratiam recipi, et peccata remitti propter Christum, qui sua morte pro nostris peccatis satisfecit. Hanc fidem imputat Deus pro justitia coram ipso (Rom. iii. et iv.)."

CONFESSIO VARIATA, Art. "De Fide":

> "Cum igitur dicimus, Fide justificamur, non hoc intelligimus quod justi simus propter ipsius virtutis dignitatem. Sed haec est sententia, consequi nos remissionem peccatorum, et imputationem justitiae, per misericordiam propter Christum."

SAXON CONFESSION, Art. III.:

> "Hac fide cum erigitur, certum est donari remissionem peccatorum, reconciliationem et imputationem justitiae, propter ipsius Christi meritum."

FORMULA OF CONCORD (p. 685):

> "Vocabulum justificationis in hoc negotio significat justum pronuntiare, a peccatis et aeternis peccatorum suppliciis absolvere propter justitiam Christi, quae a Deo fidei imputatur."

It will be noticed that three of the formularies just quoted, which express the views of the Saxon, or Lutheran, school of Reformers, speak of the "imputation" of righteousness. Calvin also, in dealing with this subject, uses the term "imputation." See INSTITUTES, III. xi. 2:—

> "Ita nos justificationem simpliciter interpretamur acceptionem qua nos Deus, in gratiam receptos, pro justis habet. Eamque in

peccatorum remissione, ac justitiae Christi imputatione positam esse dicimus."

Cf. also the following quotations from Confessions belonging to the Swiss school:—

French Confession, Art. XVIII.:

"Credimus totam nostram justitiam positam esse in peccatorum nostrorum remissione, quae sit etiam, ut testatur David, unica nostra felicitas. Itaque ceteras omnes rationes quibus homines existimant se coram Deo posse justificari, plane repudiamus: omnique virtutum et meritorum opinione abjecta, in sola Jesu Christi obedientia prorsus acquiescimus, quae quidem nobis imputatur, tum ut tegantur omnia nostra peccata, tum etiam ut gratiam coram Deo nanciscamur."

Second Helvetic Confession, Art. XV.:

"Proprie ergo loquendo, Deus solus nos justificat, et duntaxat propter Christum nos justificat, non imputans nobis peccata, sed imputans ejus nobis justitiam . . . ideo docemus et credimus cum apostolo, hominem peccatorem justificari sola fide in Christum, non lege, aut ullis operibus."

The Westminster divines, in their revision of the eleventh of the XXXIX. Articles, inserted a clause:—

"His (Christ's) whole obedience and satisfaction being by God imputed unto us."[1]

Our Article differs from the great number of Continental Confessions, in that it does not discuss at length the meaning of 'Justification.' The only approach to a definition of the term is that which is implied in the wording of the Article, "**justi coram Deo reputamur.**"

The fourth of the XIII. Articles, which were the outcome of an attempt to draw the English and German Reformers together, runs thus:—

"Item de justificatione docemus, quod ea proprie significat remissionem peccatorum et acceptationem seu reconciliationem nostram in gratiam et favorem Dei, hoc est veram renovationem in Christo."

It is somewhat remarkable that in subsequent English formularies this phraseology is altogether departed from.

[1] See Appendix IV.

(3.) Having Special Regard to the Needs of the Time, the Article further emphasises the Doctrine of Justification by Faith only, and refers to the Homily on the Subject.

Wherefore, that we are justified by Faith only, is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort, as more largely is expressed in the Homily of Justification.

It is obvious that the best works of man are faulty and imperfect; if, therefore, God were to enter into judgment with man, no one living would be able to stand before Him (Ps. cxliii. 2), and we might well despair if it were left to us to bring ourselves into right relation to God by our own merits. It is, therefore, most comforting to be assured that we enter into *δικαιοσύνη* before God by accepting in faith what Christ has done for us.

There is no homily with the title "Homily of Justification," but the "Homily of Salvation," which deals with the subject, is evidently the one to which reference is made. In illustration of the statements of the Article we may quote a short passage from this homily:—

> "And therefore St. Paul declareth here nothing upon the behalf of man concerning his justification, but only a true and lively faith: which nevertheless is the gift of God and not man's only work without God. And yet that faith doth not shut out repentance, hope, love, dread, and the fear of God, to be joined with faith in every man that is justified; but it shutteth them out from the office of justifying. So that although they be all present together in him that is justified, yet they justify not all together. Nor that faith also doth not shut out the justice of our good works, necessarily to be done afterward of duty towards God, (for we are most bounden to serve God in doing good deeds commanded by Him in His Holy Scripture, all the days of our life;) but it excludeth them so that we may not do them to this intent, to be made good by doing of them" (pp. 22, 23; ed. S.P.C.K.).

ARTICLE XII

OF GOOD WORKS.

Albeit that good works, which are the fruits of faith, and follow after Justification, cannot put away our sins, and endure the severity of God's judgment: yet are they pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, and do spring out necessarily of a true and lively faith, insomuch that by them a lively faith may be as evidently known, as a tree discerned by the fruit.

DE BONIS OPERIBUS.

Bona opera quae sunt fructus Fidei et justificatos sequuntur, quanquam peccata nostra expiare et Divini judicii severitatem ferre non possunt, Deo tamen grata sunt et accepta in Christo, atque ex vera et viva fide necessario profluunt, ut plane ex illis, aeque fides viva cognosci possit, atque arbor ex fructu judicari.

§ 1.—*SOURCE.*

This was one of the new Articles added in 1563, and appears to have been borrowed to some extent from the Article "De Bonis Operibus" in the WURTEMBURG CONFESSION, in which the following passage occurs:—

> "Non est autem sentiendum, quod iis bonis operibus, quae nos facimus, in judicio Dei, ubi agitur de expiatione peccatorum, et placatione divinae irae, ac merito aeternae salutis, confidendum sit. Omnia enim bona opera, quae nos facimus, sunt imperfecta, nec possunt severitatem divini judicii ferre."

§ 2.—*OBJECT.*

Article XI. emphasises the great Reformation doctrine of Justification by Faith only; Article XII. was drawn up with the view of guarding against the practical evil which had been seen to arise from the misunderstanding of that great doctrine. Luther laid so much stress on faith that he came to depreciate works, and even to deny them their proper place, and to speak of S. James' Epistle, which emphasises the necessity of good

works, as "straminea epistola."[1] Calvin's exaggerated teaching on the subject of Predestination also tended to depreciation of man's work. The matter, of course, did not rest with the authors of these teachings; their followers went much further, with the result that antinomianism became widely prevalent. It was in order to meet this evil outcome of the teaching of some of the Reformers that this Article was framed in 1563.

§ 3.—*EXPOSITION.*

(1.) Good Works are in themselves not Meritorious.

Good works . . . cannot put away our sins and endure the severity of God's judgment:

Two things are here affirmed with regard to good works:—

(*a*) They cannot put away (**expiare**) sin.

Only the Blood of Christ can expiate sin (1 S. John i. 7); and it is a fatal error to put human merit in its place, as was too often done in mediæval times.

(*b*) They cannot endure the severity of God's judgment.

We must all acknowledge that there is something of imperfection even in our best deeds (Ps. cxliii. 2).[2] Good works, therefore, are not rewarded "*de condigno*," *i.e.*, because of their deserving it.[3]

With the teaching of the Article on this head we should contrast—

(i.) The doctrine of the Church of Rome, according to which the good works of those who are justified are in themselves meritorious. See Council of Trent, Session VI., Canon XXXII.:—

"Si quis dixerit, hominis justificati bona opera ita esse dona Dei, ut non sint etiam bona ipsius justificati merita; aut ipsum

[1] Preface to the New Testament, 1524, p. 105.

[2] *Cf.* the Homily "Of the Misery of Man," Part ii. p. 17:

"Neither may we rejoice in any works that we do, which all be so imperfect and impure that they are not able to stand before the righteous judgment-seat of God."

[3] As to the meaning of the scholastic phrase "*meritum de condigno*" see notes on Art. XIII. The doctrine expressed by it was repudiated by the Continental, as by the English, Reformers. See, *e.g.*, Saxon Confession, Art. IX.:

"Ideo inanis est imaginatio fingentium obedientiam placere sua dignitate, et esse meritum condigni, ut loquuntur, et justitiam coram Deo, quae sit meritum vitae aeternae.'

justificatum bonis operibus, quae ab eo per Dei gratiam et Christi meritum fiunt, non vere mereri augmentum gratiae, vitam aeternam et ipsius vitae aeternae, si tamen in gratia decesserit, consecutionem, atque etiam gloriae augmentum; anathema sit."

(ii.) The tenets of Pelagius and his followers, who held that some men have lived perfectly sinless lives,[1] so that their works would be able to endure the severity of God's judgment.

(2.) Good Works are pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ.

yet are they pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ,

Though not meritorious in themselves, yet the good works of Christians are pleasing to God, because of our union with Christ (see 1 S. Pet. ii. 5; Eph. ii. 10; Tit. ii. 14, iii. 8; Heb. xiii. 16, 20, 21). To deny this is to divorce morality from religion. Some of the Reformers, however, did deny it,[2] and no more severe blow could be struck at Christian morality.

(3.) The Relation of Good Works to Justifying Faith.

Good works . . . are the fruits of faith, and follow after Justification, . . . and do spring out necessarily of a true and lively faith, insomuch that by them a lively faith may be as evidently known, as a tree discerned by the fruit.

The relation of good works to faith is here very clearly and carefully stated:—

(*a*) Good works are the fruits of faith.

(*b*) They do spring necessarily out of faith, so that where true faith is we may be sure that good works will also be found, and where good works are wanting faith is certainly dead (S. Matt. vii. 16–20; Tit. ii. 14; S. Jas. ii. 17–26).

(*c*) Thus works do not precede faith, so that a man may be justified by them, but follow after justification (**justificatos sequuntur**)—Eph. ii. 8–10.

The "Homily of Salvation," referred to in the last Article, lays down in similar language the proper relation of good works to faith:—

---

[1] See notes on Art. IX.

[2] Luther, *e.g.*, in 1518 offered to maintain this proposition at Heidelberg against all comers: "Non ille justus est qui multum operatur, sed qui sine opere multum credit in Christum."

"Nor when they say that we be justified freely, they mean not that we should or might afterward be idle, and that nothing should be required on our parts afterward; neither they mean not so to be justified without our good works, that we should do no good works at all" (p. 25). . . .

"It followeth necessarily that some other thing should be required for our salvation than the law; and that is a true and lively faith in Christ, bringing forth good works and a life according to God's commandments" (p. 28). . . .

"Our office is not to pass the time of this present life unfruitfully and idly after that we are baptized or justified, not caring how few good works we do to the glory of God and profit of our neighbours: much less it is our office, after that we be once made Christ's members, to live contrary to the same" (pp. 29, 30).

Some examples may be given to show how this question of the relation of good works to faith is treated in the Confessions of the Protestant and Reformed bodies on the Continent:—

Augsburg Confession, Part I. Art. XX.:

"Falso accusantur nostri, quod bona opera prohibeant. . . .

"Principio, quod opera nostra non possint reconciliare Deum, aut mereri remissionem peccatorum, et gratiam et justificationem, sed hanc tantum fide consequimur. . . .

"Praeterea docent nostri, quod necesse sit bona opera facere, non ut confidamus per ea gratiam mereri, sed propter voluntatem Dei. Tantum fide apprehenditur remissio peccatorum ac gratia. Et quia per fidem accipitur Spiritus Sanctus, jam corda renovantur, et induunt novos affectus, ut parere bona opera possint."

Tetrapolitan Confession, Cap. III. and Cap. V.:

"Primum igitur cum jam aliquot annis, ad justificationem hominis, requiri propria ejus opera traditum sit, nostri hanc totam divinae benevolentiae, Christique merito acceptam referendam, solaque fide percipi docuerunt. . . .

"His bona opera, tam non rejicimus, ut prorsus negemus quenquam plene posse salvum fieri, nisi huc per spiritum Christi evaserit, ut nihil jam bonorum operum in eo desyderetur, ad quae quidem Deus illum condidit."

Bohemian Confession, Articles IX. and X.:

"Salvifica fides . . . ita per charitatem operatur quaevis bona et sancta opera, ex quibus tanquam arbor ex fructibus cognoscitur. Sicut enim ignis absque calore, et sol absque splendore: ita etiam vera fides et Christi particeps, sine renovatione et sine charitate, adeoque sine multis sanctis et bonis operibus nunquam et nusquam esse potest. . . .

"Et talia bona opera placent Deo, non propter propriam ipsorum dignitatem et perfectionem . . . sed placent Deo per solum Christum Iesum in persona vel homine, qui prius a Christo Domino per fidem in ipsum justificatus, et Deo acceptus redditus est, quando credit."

Belgic Confession, Art. XXIV.:

"Fieri itaque non potest ut haec fides sancta in homine otiosa sit. Neque enim loquimur de fide vana atque mortua, sed de ea tantum quae in scriptura dicitur per charitatem operari: quaeque impellit hominem ut in illis sese operibus exerceat, quae Deus ipse in verbo suo praecepit. Haec vero opera a sincera fidei hujus radice emanantia, ideo demum bona et Deo grata sunt, quia per illius gratiam sanctificantur: ad nos autem justificandos nullius sunt prorsus momenti."

Second Helvetic Confession, Art. XVI.:

"Docemus enim vere bona opera enasci ex viva fide, per Spiritum Sanctum, et a fidelibus fieri secundum voluntatem vel regulam verbi Dei. . . . Damnamus itaque omnes qui bona opera contemnunt, non curanda et inutilia esse blaterant. Interim, quod et antea dictum est, non sentimus per opera bona nos servari, illaque ad salutem ita esse necessaria, ut absque illis nemo unquam sit servatus."

Some difficulty has been caused by the apparent contradiction between the statements of S. Paul and S. James as to the place to be assigned to good works. Contrast Rom. iii. 20; iv. 2, 3; v. 1, with S. Jas. ii. 14, 21, 24, 26. The seeming contradiction may, however, be cleared up by a careful examination of the meaning of the terms used, and by keeping in mind the purpose with which each Apostle is writing.

The Epistle of S. James is a practical letter; he has in mind people who are content with a profession of belief only, and make no attempt to live up to it, and so, like a prophet of the Old Testament, or a practical preacher of our own day, S. James warns people that their life must be consistent with their profession, that mere intellectual acceptance is useless. "The demons believe," he says, but they are none the better; they shudder, and are demons still (ii. 19). The man who relies upon faith is challenged to show his faith apart from works. Such exhibition is, of course, impossible. The test and proof of faith lies in the actions of life (ii. 14–18), so that where good works are found a living faith may be known to exist (*cf.* S. Matt. vii. 16). By deeds, therefore, man will eventually be justified, his works form-

ing the ground of God's judgment at the last day (*cf.* S. Matt. vii. 22, 23; Rom. ii. 5, 6; 2 Cor. v. 10, xi. 15; Rev. xx. 12, xxii. 12).

The Epistle to the Romans is a theological treatise, and therefore the author approaches the subject of the relation of faith and works from a different standpoint. 'Justification,' as we have already seen, means with S. Paul the entering upon a state of *δικαιοσύνη*, the coming of sinful man into a right relation with God, which is the starting-point of a new life. No efforts of man's own can attain this *δικαιοσύνη* for himself, he has no power of himself to help himself, he is only required to accept in faith what God has done for him through Christ; in other words, man is justified (in S. Paul's sense of the term) by faith only, and not by works. At the same time the Apostle makes it clear in his writings that good works follow upon justification (Eph. ii. 10); that faith which justifies is not idle or barren, but issues in obedience (Rom. vi. 16), working by love (Gal. v. 6; 1 Thess. i. 3), and without love is altogether valueless (1 Cor. xiii. 2).

§ 4.—*NOTEWORTHY EXPRESSION IN THIS ARTICLE.*

The phrase "**justificatos sequuntur**" should be noted. It is traceable to S. Augustine. *Cf.* "De Fide et Operibus," Cap. xiv. § 31:—

> "Sequuntur enim (bona opera) justificatum, non praecedunt justificandum."

This passage of S. Augustine is quoted in the "Homily on Fasting" (p. 292; ed. S.P.C.K.).

ARTICLE XIII

OF WORKS BEFORE JUSTIFICATION.

Works done before the Grace of Christ, and the Inspiration of His Spirit, are not pleasant to God, forasmuch as they spring not of faith in Jesus Christ, neither do they make men meet to receive grace, or (as the School-authors say) deserve grace of congruity: yea rather for that they are not done as God hath willed and commanded them to be done, we doubt not but they have the nature of sin.

DE OPERIBUS ANTE JUSTIFICATIONEM.

Opera quae fiunt ante gratiam Christi, et Spiritus ejus afflatum, cum ex fide Jesu Christi non prodeant, minime Deo grata sunt: neque gratiam (ut multi vocant) de congruo merentur: Imo cum non sint facta ut Deus illa fieri voluit et praecepit, peccati rationem habere non dubitamus.

§ 1.—*SOURCE.*

This Article was composed by the English Reformers. In the XLII. Articles of 1553, as published, the Article runs exactly as at present, but in a previous draft the first clause is slightly different:—

"Opera quae fiunt ante justificationem, cum ex fide," &c.

The wording was altered to its present form before the Articles were published, but the title remained unaltered. Hence the discrepancy now existing between the title and contents of the Article. A more exact title would be, Of Works before Faith, or, Of Works before Grace.

§ 2.—*OBJECT.*

To condemn the scholastic doctrine (expressly referred to in the Article), that the favour of God may be gained by man, and the bestowal of grace merited, as the reward of actions done merely in his own strength, and without any dependence on the Holy Spirit. This Article is thus strongly anti-Pelagian.

§ 3.—*EXPOSITION.*

In Article XII. it is laid down that works which follow after, and spring out of, faith are pleasing and acceptable to God. The question now arises, What are we to say of works of man which are done before faith, or before the Inspiration of the Holy Spirit? The Schoolmen spoke of a twofold merit attaching to human actions:—

(i.) *Merit de congruo,* which they ascribed to such works as man does by his own unaided strength, without God's grace. Such works, they taught, would be rewarded out of God's liberality.

(ii.) *Merit de condigno,* which they ascribed to such works as are done with the assistance of grace, and to which a reward was held to be due as a matter of justice.

We have seen that in Article XII. the doctrine of merit *de condigno* was rejected; in the Article now under consideration a like emphatic denial is given to the doctrine of merit *de congruo.* Our Article treats, then, only of works done by man in his natural state, by his own unaided strength, and of such works it declares that:—

(1.) They are not pleasing to God.

Works done before the Grace of Christ, and the Inspiration of His Spirit, are not pleasant to God, forasmuch as they spring not of faith in Jesus Christ, (See Rom. viii. 7, 8; S. John xv. 5.)

(2.) They cannot make Men meet to receive Grace (or, in the technical language of the scholastic theology, they do not deserve grace of congruity).

neither do they make men meet to receive grace, or (as the School-authors say) deserve grace of congruity: (Rom. iv. 2, 6; Tit. iii. 5.)

This is, in reality, only another way of saying that no works or efforts of our own can avail at all for bringing us into a state of favour with, neither can they constitute any claim upon, God.

(3.) They have the Nature of Sin.

yea rather for that they are not done as God hath willed and commanded them to be done, we doubt not but they have the nature of sin. (Rom. xiv. 23; Tit. i. 15; Heb. xi. 6.)

This last clause has caused some difficulty, because the Article seems at first sight to class any efforts after goodness

on the part of the heathen as sin. But such a position would be contrary to the teaching of Scripture, as given, *e.g.*, in what is recorded of the Roman centurion Cornelius, who did not belong to God's Covenant people, and yet his good works were acceptable to God (Acts x. 4). The answer to the difficulty in which we here seem to be involved is to be found in the doctrine of 'Preventing Grace': the works of Cornelius, even in his Gentile state, were not done without faith, or apart from the grace of God. We must recognise that God gives to all men their measure of the Holy Spirit; many, indeed, may quench the Spirit, but to His blessed influence is to be attributed whatever of goodness is found in the lives of righteous heathen. There is a "Light which lighteth every man" (S. John i. 9), so that even the heathen are led to seek the Lord, if haply they might find Him (Acts xvii. 27). To this Divine Light we must attribute all that is good in mankind. But good works done without this—*e.g.*, from pride, self-righteousness, love of praise, or other similar motives—are not pleasing to God, and have the nature of sin.

With our Article we should compare the Canons of the 6th Session of the Council of Trent:—

"Canon I.—Si quis dixerit, hominem suis operibus, quae vel per humanae naturae vires vel per legis doctrinam fiant, absque divina per Christum gratia, posse justificari coram Deo: anathema sit.

"Canon III.—Si quis dixerit, sine praeveniente Spiritus Sancti inspiratione, atque ejus adjutorio, hominem credere, sperare, diligere, aut poenitere posse, sicut oportet, ut ei justificationis gratia conferatur: anathema sit.

"Canon VII.—Si quis dixerit, opera omnia, quae ante justificationem fiunt, quacunque ratione facta sint, vere esse peccata vel odium Dei mereri, aut, quanto vehementius quis nititur se disponere ad gratiam, tanto eum gravius peccare: anathema sit."

It will be seen that the doctrine of the Roman Church, as defined by the Council, agrees in the main with that laid down in the English Article. There is, however, one point of divergence which should not be overlooked. Canon VII. anathematises those who hold that 'works before justification' are truly and properly sins. Our Article does not, indeed, affirm that such works *are* sin, but it uses with respect to them the same

guarded phrase which we have already noticed in Article IX., and declares that they "have the nature of sin" (peccati rationem habere).[1]

§ 4.—*NOTEWORTHY EXPRESSION IN THIS ARTICLE.*

The School-authors.

We may briefly describe Scholasticism as an attempt to unite theology and philosophy by systematising theology upon a philosophic basis. It may be said to date from the time of Charlemagne, the monasteries established by him becoming the schools of a revived study of philosophy; and, since learning and literary skill were in those times chiefly confined to ecclesiastics, it was natural that philosophical activity should show itself chiefly in the domain of theology. From the ninth to the eleventh centuries we have the rise of Scholasticism. During the latter half of the twelfth century came the struggle between the Nominalists and the Realists,[2] which resulted in the triumph of the latter. The twelfth and thirteenth centuries may be regarded as the prime of Scholasticism, and the three most renowned of the Schoolmen were Albertus Magnus,[3] Thomas Aquinas,[4] and John Duns Scotus.[5]

[1] The formularies influenced by the Calvinistic Theology, which emphasises the total corruption of the natural man, lay stress, as we should expect, upon the sinful character of works done by man in his natural state. See the text of Article XIII. as revised by the Westminster divines, Appendix IV.

[2] This controversy was with respect to our abstract or general ideas. The Realists contended that an abstraction—*e.g.*, circle, beauty, right—had a *real* existence (apart from round things, beautiful objects, right actions). Those that held the opposite view were called Nominalists, since they held that there is nothing general but *names; e.g.*, the name circle is applied to round things, and is merely a general name.

[3] Count of Bollstädt, a Dominican, born 1193 or 1205; died 1280.

[4] A Dominican, born 1224; died 1274. He was the author of the famous 'Summa Theologiae,' and is called the 'Angelic doctor.' His followers inclined rather to Nominalism; they followed S. Augustine on the doctrine of Grace, and were opposed to the teaching which was springing up in some quarters as to the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin.

[5] A Franciscan, died 1308. The Scotists inclined to Realism, and somewhat to Pelagianism; they strongly upheld the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin.

ARTICLE XIV

OF WORKS OF SUPEREROGATION.

Voluntary works besides, over and above God's commandments, which they call Works of Supererogation, cannot be taught without arrogance and impiety. For by them men do declare that they do not only render unto God as much as they are bound to do, but that they do more for His sake than of bounden duty is required: whereas Christ saith plainly, When ye have done all that are commanded to you, say, We are unprofitable servants.

DE OPERIBUS SUPEREROGATIONIS.

Opera quae supererogationis appellant, non possunt sine arrogantia et impietate praedicari. Nam illis declarant homines non tantum se Deo reddere quae tenentur, sed plus in ejus gratiam facere quam deberent: Cum aperte Christus dicat: Cum feceritis omnia quaecunque praecepta sunt vobis, dicite: Servi inutiles sumus.

§ 1.—*SOURCE.*

Composed by the English Reformers, 1552–3.

§ 2.—*OBJECT.*

To condemn the doctrine of Works of Supererogation taught by some of the later Schoolmen.

§ 3.—*EXPOSITION.*

(1.) What is meant by "Works of Supererogation."

Voluntary works besides, over and above God's commandments, which they call Works of Supererogation.

The term 'Supererogation' is derived from the Latin *super-erogare*. *Erogare* strictly signifies "to vote money out of the treasury," but is also used in the more general sense "to spend." *Supererogare* therefore means "to spend more than is required." The verb is used in the Vulgate, S. Luke x. 35, "quodcumque supererogaveris," *i.e.*, whatsoever thou shalt have spent over and above.

The distinction had been drawn by the later Schoolmen, and divines of the Roman Church, between the commandments of God, which all men are obliged to keep, and Counsels of Perfection, which are assumed to be over and above God's commandments, and to which it is given to some to attain. Some passages of Scripture were held to favour this distinction; see especially S. Matt. xix. 11, 12, 21; 1 Cor. vii. 1, 7, 25. Thus vows of poverty, or of chastity, being not necessary for all Christians, came to be looked upon as meritorious in themselves, and it was imagined that those who took such vows were doing more for God than was required of them.

In the decrees of the Council of Trent nothing is laid down concerning '*consilia evangelica*' or '*consilia perfectionis*,' but we may judge of current teaching from the writings of Bellarmine. See his 'De Monachis':—

Cap. VII.—"Consilium perfectionis vocamus opus bonum, a Christo nobis non imperatum, sed demonstratum, non mandatum sed commendatum."

Cap. VIII.—"Sententia est catholicorum omnium, multa esse vere et proprie consilia evangelica, sed praecipue tria, continentiam, obedientiam et paupertatem, quae nec sint praecepta nec indifferentia, sed Deo grata, et ab illa commendata."

Cap. XII.—"Videmus in omnibus bene institutis rebuspublicis praeter praemia et poenas . . . esse etiam praemia quaedam decreta heroicis operibus; . . . ita ergo non abhorret a ratione, imo potius conforme est rationi, ut praeter vitam aeternam, promissam observatoribus legis divinae, sint etiam certa praemia et singulares honores pro iis, qui non solum Dei legem servant, sed etiam virtutes heroicas ostendunt."

(2.) The Doctrine of Works of Supererogation is arrogant and impious.

Works of Supererogation cannot be taught without arrogance and impiety. For by them men do declare that they do not only render unto God as much as they are bound to do, but that they do more for His sake than of bounden duty is required; whereas Christ saith plainly, When ye have done all that are commanded to you, say, We are unprofitable servants.

What God requires of us is nothing short of this:—to love Him with all the heart, with all the soul, with all the strength, and with all the mind (S. Luke x. 27); that we

should be perfect, even as He is perfect (S. Matt. v. 48). It is obviously impossible to do *more* than fulfil this requirement of God; on the contrary, we all fall far short of it; we all need to pray continually, as our Lord has taught us, "Forgive us our trespasses" (S. Matt. vi. 12; S. Luke xi. 4), and, if there is any truth in us, we shall all acknowledge our own unworthiness (see S. Luke xvii. 10, the passage referred to in the Article). It is not, of course, denied that vows of poverty, chastity, &c., have their place in the Christian Religion; but the mistake lies (so the Article shows us) in considering such works to be over and above God's commandments. To those who feel themselves called to such state of life the so-called 'Counsels of Perfection' *become God's commandments.*

To suppose that there is a certain fixed measure of obedience beyond which it is not necessary to go, **that we render unto God as much as we are bound to do, is impiety,** since the Perfection of God Himself is our standard. Again, **to imagine that we do more than of bounden duty is required is arrogance,** because we ourselves, body, soul, and spirit, are entirely God's, so that we owe ourselves and all that we have to His service. Where all is thus owing it is impossible that part can be over-pay.

Concerning the subject treated in this Article we may compare:—

Wurtemburg Confession, Art. 'De Lege':

"Sed quod nonnulli sentiunt hominem posse in hac vita eo pervenire, ut non tantum impleat suis operibus Decalogum, verum etiam possit plura et majora opera facere, quam in Decalogo praecepta sunt, quae vocant opera supererogationis, alienum est a prophetica et Apostolica doctrina, et pugnat cum sententia verae Catholicae Ecclesiae."

Westminster Confession, XVI. 4.:

"They who in their obedience attain to the greatest height which is possible in this life, are so far from being able to supererogate, and to do more than God requires, as that they fall short of much which in duty they are bound to do."

ARTICLE XV

OF CHRIST ALONE WITHOUT SIN.

Christ in the truth of our nature, was made like unto us in all things, sin only except, from which He was clearly void, both in His flesh, and in His spirit. He came to be the Lamb without spot, Who by sacrifice of Himself once made, should take away the sins of the world; and sin, as Saint John saith, was not in Him. But all we the rest, although baptized, and born again in Christ, yet offend in many things, and if we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.

DE CHRISTO QUI SOLUS EST SINE PECCATO.

Christus in nostrae naturae veritate per omnia similis factus est nobis, excepto peccato, a quo prorsus erat immunis, tum in carne tum in spiritu. Venit, ut agnus absque macula esset, qui mundi peccata per immolationem sui semel factam, tolleret: et peccatum (ut inquit Johannes) in eo non erat. Sed nos reliqui, etiam baptizati, et in Christo regenerati, in multis tamen offendimus omnes: Et si dixerimus quia peccatum non habemus, nos ipsos seducimus, et veritas in nobis non est.

§ 1.—*SOURCE.*

Composed by the English Reformers, 1552–3.

§ 2.—*OBJECT.*

This Article was drawn up to guard against a prevalent form of Anabaptism. In a letter to Bullinger, dated June 25, 1549, Hooper thus writes of the Anabaptists:—

> "They contend that a man who is reconciled to God is without sin, and free from all stain of concupiscence, and that nothing of the old Adam remains in his nature; and a man, they say, who is thus regenerate cannot sin" (Original Letters, p. 65).

Cf. also REFORMATIO LEGUM, 'De Haeresibus,' Cap. 8:—

> "Illorum etiam superbia legibus nostris est frangenda, qui tantam vitae perfectionem hominibus justificatis attribuunt, quantam nec imbecillitas nostrae naturae fert, nec quisquam sibi praeter Christum sumere potest."

See further the notes on Article XVI.

The compilers of the Article may also have had in view scholastic teaching with regard to the sinlessness of the Blessed Virgin.

§ 3.—*EXPOSITION.*

(1.) Christ's true Manhood does not include Participation in Sin.

Christ in the truth of our nature, was made like unto us in all things, sin only except, from which He was clearly void, both in His flesh, and in His spirit.

Christ was perfect man. Sin is not part of human nature, but a fault and corruption of it. In sin, therefore, He had no share (S. John viii. 46, xiv. 30; 2 Cor. v. 21; Heb. iv. 15; 1 S. Pet. ii. 22; 1 S. John iii. 5).

(2.) The Effect of the Death of the Sinless One.

He came to be the Lamb without spot, Who by sacrifice of Himself once made, should take away the sins of the world, and sin, as Saint John saith, was not in Him. (See S. John i. 29; 1 S. Pet. i. 19.)

The fact of our Lord's sinlessness infuses an element of righteousness (2 Cor. v. 21) and sacrificial power (1 S. Pet. ii. 22–24; Heb. ix. 14) into His death. If Christ could have been convicted of one single sin, He would have been disqualified for the altar; He might, indeed, have died as a martyr and left a noble example, but could not have been accepted as the atoning Sacrifice for sin (Eph. v. 2; and *cf.* 1 S. John iii. 5, the passage quoted in the Article). The Atonement has been already treated in Article II., but we should notice that three points with regard to our Lord's death are here emphasised:—

(*a*) Its expiatory character—**Who by sacrifice of Himself . . . should take away the sins** (1 S. John ii. 2; iv. 10).

(*b*) Its unique character; the Sacrifice of Christ was **once made**, and cannot be repeated[1] (Heb ix. 26).

(*c*) That it avails for all sin[2]—**should take away the sins of the world** (1 S. John ii. 2).

If any sins remain unforgiven at last, it will not be

[1] *Cf.* Article XXXI.

[2] The sufficiency of Christ's Atoning Sacrifice for all sin is several times dwelt upon in the Articles. See notes on Articles IX. and XXXI.

because of any defect or shortcoming in Christ's sacrificial work, but because men have refused to confess and forsake them.

(3.) No other Human Being was, or is, perfectly good.

But all we the rest, although baptized, and born again in Christ, yet offend in many things, and if we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.

The words of the Article here are taken from S. Jas. iii. 2 and 1 S. John i. 8.

The subject of the sin of the regenerate is further treated in Article XVI., where see notes.

There is no express allusion in the Article to the question of the sinlessness of the Blessed Virgin, but it is very probable that the compilers, in drawing it up, had in mind current teaching upon the subject. The title of the Article itself, "Christ alone without Sin," excludes extravagant doctrine on this point. It would seem to be self-evident that our Lord's Mother, having been born in the usual way, of human parents, must have shared in the taint of Original Sin. Scripture, indeed, speaks of her as "highly favoured" or "full of grace"[1] (*κεχαριτωμένη*), and as "blessed among women" (S. Luke i. 28, 42, 43, 48; xi. 27, 28); and it was a pious opinion in early times that the grace of God did work so mightily in her that she was preserved from actual sin.[2] Duns Scotus and the Franciscan divines, who followed his lead, began to teach (circ. 1300) her immaculate conception, *i.e.*, her freedom from Original Sin; and the Council of Trent in its decree on 'Original Sin' (Session V.) expressly excepts the Blessed Virgin from what is laid down under that head:—

> "Declarat tamen haec ipsa sancta synodus, non esse suae intentionis comprehendere in hoc decreto, ubi de peccato originali agitur, beatam et immaculatam Virginem Mariam."

The "Immaculate Conception" of our Lord's Mother was not, however, declared to be a doctrine of the Catholic Church until 1854, when Pope Pius IX. issued (December 8th) the famous Bull "Ineffabilis":—

> "Declaramus, pronuntiamus et definimus, doctrinam, quae tenet, beatissimam virginem Mariam in primo instanti suae conceptionis

[1] "Gratia plena" is the rendering of the Vulgate in S. Luke i. 28, and with this the Syriac Version agrees.

[2] See S. Augustine, 'De Natura et Gratia,' § 42.

fuisse singulari omnipotentis Dei gratia et privilegio, intuitu meritorum Christi Jesu salvatoris humani generis, ab omni originalis culpae labe praeservatam immunem, esse a Deo revelatam, atque idcirco ab omnibus fidelibus firmiter constanterque credendam."

Such doctrine of the absolute freedom of the Blessed Virgin from all participation in sin has no foundation in Holy Scripture, and is implicitly repudiated by our Church in this fifteenth Article. Our Reformers at the same time speak of her with that veneration and respect which is due. See, *e.g.*, the HOMILY OF REPENTANCE, Part I. p. 564:—

"Jesus Christ, Who being true and natural God, equal and of one substance with the Father, did at the time appointed take upon Him our frail nature, in the blessed Virgin's womb, and that of her undefiled substance; that so He might be a Mediator betwixt God and us, and pacify His wrath."

Again, in the HOMILY ON WILFUL REBELLION, Part II. p. 607, we read:—

"The obedience of this most noble and most virtuous lady to a foreign and pagan prince doth well teach us, who in comparison to her are most base and vile, what ready obedience we do owe to our natural and gracious Sovereign."

ARTICLE XVI

OF SIN AFTER BAPTISM.

Not every deadly sin willingly committed after Baptism, is sin against the Holy Ghost, and unpardonable. Wherefore the grant of repentance is not to be denied to such as fall into sin after Baptism.

After we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from grace given, and fall into sin, and by the grace of God we may arise again and amend our lives. And therefore, they are to be condemned, which say they can no more sin as long as they live here, or deny the place of forgiveness to such as truly repent.

DE PECCATO POST BAPTISMUM.

Non omne peccatum mortale post Baptismum voluntarie perpetratum, est peccatum in Spiritum Sanctum et irremissibile. Proinde lapsis a Baptismo in peccata, locus poenitentiae non est negandus.

Post acceptum Spiritum Sanctum, possumus a gratia data recedere atque peccare, denuoque per gratiam Dei resurgere ac resipiscere. Ideoque illi damnandi sunt, qui se quamdiu hic vivant, amplius non posse peccare affirmant, aut vere resipiscentibus veniae locum denegant.

§ 1.—*SOURCE.*

Composed by the English Reformers, 1552–3.

§ 2.—*OBJECT.*

To condemn a very dangerous form of Anabaptist teaching. In the Article 'De Falsa Poenitentia' of the SCHMALKALD ARTICLES certain 'sectarii' are alluded to who said:—

> 'Fac quicquid lubet, modo credas, nihil tibi nocet, fides omnia peccata delet:' addunt praeterea, 'Si quis post fidem et Spiritum acceptum peccet, eum nunquam Spiritum et fidem vere habuisse.'

Cf. also REFORMATIO LEGUM, 'De Haeresibus,' Cap. 9:—

> "Etiam illi de justificatis perverse sentiunt, qui credunt illos, postquam justi semel facti sunt, in peccatum non posse incidere, aut si forte quicquam eorum faciunt, quae Dei legibus prohibentur, ea Deum pro peccatis non accipere. Quibus opinione contrarii, sed impietate pares sunt, qui quodcumque peccatum mortale, quod

post baptismum a nobis susceptum voluntate nostra committitur, illud omne contra Spiritum Sanctum affirmant gestum esse et remitti non posse."

That the errors condemned in the Article had found their way into this country is also shown by the fact that in Stat. 32 Henry VIII. c. 49, § 11, they are excluded from the king's pardon who hold "That synners after baptisme cannot be restored by repentaunce." See also Hooper's letter to Bullinger quoted in the notes on Article XV. § 2. After the words there cited he continues:—

"They add that all hope of pardon is taken away from those who, after having received the Holy Ghost, fall into sin."

[The XLII. Articles of 1553 contained one on "Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost," which immediately followed the Article on "Sin after Baptism." It was, however, struck out in 1563, most likely from reluctance to define the unpardonable sin:—

BLASPHEMY AGAINST THE HOLY GHOST.

Blasphemie against the holie Ghost is, when a man of malice and stubburnesse of minde, doeth raile upon the trueth of Goddes word manifestlie perceiued, and being enemie thereunto persecuteth the same. And because soche be guilty of Goddes curse, thei entangle themselves with a moste grievous, and hainous crime, wherupon this kinde of sinne is called and affirmed of the Lord, unpardonable.

BLASPHEMIA IN SPIRITUM SANCTUM.

Blasphemia in Spiritum Sanctum, est cum quis Verborum Dei manifeste perceptam veritatem, ex malitia et obfirmatione animi, convitiis insectatur, et hostiliter insequitur. Atque hujusmodi, quia maledicto sunt obnoxii, gravissimo sese astringunt sceleri. Unde peccati hoc genus Irremissible a Domino appellatur, et affirmatur.]

§ 3.—*EXPOSITION.*

(1). After receiving the Holy Ghost it is possible to Sin—we may fall from Grace.

After we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from grace given, and fall into sin. . . . And therefore they are to be condemned, which say they can no more sin as long as they live here. (See S. Jas. iii. 2; 1 S. John i 8, the passages quoted in the last Article).

The numerous exhortations to perseverance contained in Holy Scripture imply that those who have received grace

are liable to fall (*cf.* 1 Cor. ix. 27; Heb. iii. 6, vi. 4–6, x. 38; Rev. ii. 4, 5). The very figures, too, under which the gift of the Holy Spirit is spoken of in the New Testament indicate the possibility of falling away after having received the gift. Thus the gift of the Spirit is spoken of as—

(*a*) *A seal* (Eph. i. 13; iv. 30). Now a seal is that which certifies a contract, which is void if both parties do not keep it.

(*b*) *An earnest* (2 Cor. i. 22, v. 5; Eph. i. 13, 14). An earnest is part payment given in pledge of the full price, which may, however, be forfeited.

Our Church in her services continually assumes the possibility of falling from grace; *e.g.*, in the Collect for the Second Sunday in Advent, we pray "that we may embrace and ever hold fast the blessed hope of everlasting life;" and again in the Burial Service, "Suffer us not at our last hour for any pains of death to fall from Thee."

With the teaching of the Article on this head *cf.* what is said in the Article on Justification in the KING'S BOOK (Formularies of Faith, p. 367):—

> "And it is no doubt, but although we be once justified, yet we may fall therefrom by our own freewill and consenting unto sin, and following the desires thereof . . . and here all phantastical imagination, curious reasoning, and vain trust of predestination is to be laid apart."

The formularies of the Saxon School and the Canons of the Council of Trent also agree with our Article:—

AUGSBURG CONFESSION, Part I. Art. XII.:

> "Damnant Anabaptistas qui negant semel justificatos posse amittere Spiritum Sanctum. Item, qui contendunt quibusdam tantam perfectionem in hac vita contingere, ut peccare non possint."

SAXON CONFESSION, Art. XVI.:

> "Prorsus enim clare damnamus Catharos et Novatianos, qui finxerunt, nec labi posse electos in delicta contra conscientiam, nec lapsos post emendationem recipiendos esse."

COUNCIL OF TRENT, Session VI. Canon XXIII.:

> "Si quis hominem semel justificatum dixerit amplius peccare non posse, nec gratiam amittere, atque ideo eum qui labitur et peccat nunquam vere fuisse justificatum; aut contra posse in tota vita peccata omnia, etiam venalia, vitare, nisi ex speciali Dei privilegio, quemadmodum de beata Virgine Maria tenet Ecclesia: anathema sit."

Calvin's teaching, on the other hand, is altogether irreconcilable with the doctrine of our Church. He taught that Divine Grace, where it is really given, is irresistible, and therefore that the elect who have been once justified, and have received the gift of the Holy Spirit, can never fall from grace; if a member of the Church fall away, his fall must be considered a proof that he is not of the number of the elect, and that he never in reality received saving grace. *Cf.* CALVIN'S INSTITUTES, III. xxiv. 6, 7 :—

> "Jam vero neque hoc dubium est, quum orat Christus pro omnibus electis, quin idem illis precetur quod Petro, ut nunquam deficiat fides eorum. Ex quo elicimus, extra periculum defectionis esse, quia eorum pietati constantiam postulans Filius Dei, repulsam passus non est. Quid hinc nos discere voluit Christus, nisi ut confidamus perpetuo nos fore salvos, quia illius semel facti sumus? At quotidie accidit ut qui videbantur esse Christi, rursum deficiant ab eo, et corruant . . . sed aeque etiam certum, nunquam ea cordis fiducia tales Christo adhaesisse, qua nobis electionis certitudinem stabiliri dico."

That the language of our Article was unacceptable to the Calvinistic party in this country is evident from the attack which they made upon it in the "Seconde Admonition to the Parliament" (1572) :—

> "And in deede the booke of the Articles of Christian religion speaketh very dangerously of falling from grace."

See also the 5th of the LAMBETH ARTICLES :

> "Vera, viva, et justificans fides, et Spiritus Dei sanctificans, non extinguitur, non excidit, non evanescit in electis, aut finaliter, aut totaliter."

WESTMINSTER CONFESSION, XI. 5 :

> "They can never fall from the state of justification."

(2.) SIN AFTER BAPTISM, OR FALL FROM GRACE, IS NOT WHAT IS MEANT BY THE UNPARDONABLE SIN AGAINST THE HOLY GHOST.

Not every deadly sin willingly committed after Baptism, is sin against the Holy Ghost, and unpardonable.

Note that the Article expressly specifies "deadly sin willingly committed," *i.e.*, known and deliberate sin, as opposed to sin done through ignorance or infirmity. All

such sin is, in its nature, deadly (Rom. vi. 23; vii. 9), and is committed against God, the Three in One, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; but still it is not unpardonable, unless it be that sin which our Lord calls "blasphemy against the Holy Ghost" (S. Matt. xii. 31, 32; S. Mark iii. 28–30).

Our Article thus plainly declares that the unpardonable sin is not equivalent to post-Baptismal sin, but no explanation is given as to what is signified by "blasphemy against the Holy Ghost." Our Lord's most solemn warning with regard to it was evidently occasioned by the Pharisees' ascription of His works to the instrumentality of Beelzebub (S. Mark iii. 22, 30). Such conduct as theirs might then be forgiven, but it would seem that Christ warns them that if continued when He was glorified and attested by the Holy Spirit, it would be unpardonable. Thus we conclude that the sin spoken of in S. Matt. xii. 31, 32; S. Mark iii. 28, 29, is not an act, but rather a condition, which is itself the result of continued acts of sin against light and knowledge, and of grieving the Holy Spirit. *Cf.* Eph. iv. 30; 1 S. John v. 16, 17; Heb. vi. 4–6, x. 26–29. See also the explanation of "blasphemy against the Holy Ghost" given in the sixteenth Article of 1553, the text of which has been quoted above, p. 106.

Two points have been laid down:—

(i.) That it is possible to fall into sin after Baptism.

(ii.) Post-Baptismal sin is not the unpardonable sin against the Holy Ghost.

It follows, therefore, that:—

(3.) Repentance is not to be denied to such as sin after Baptism.

The grant of repentance (locus penitentiae)[1] is not to be denied to such as fall into sin after Baptism. . . . by the grace of God we may arise again and amend our lives. And therefore they are to be condemned which . . . deny the place of forgiveness to such as truly repent.

Rom. xi. 23; 2 Cor. ii. 6–8; Gal. vi. 1 may be referred to, but Holy Scripture is full of exhortations to those who have once known the favour and grace of God, and have fallen from it, that they should "repent, and do the first works" (Rev. ii. 5).

[1] The expression is taken from Heb. xii. 17.

The question of penitential discipline, and of the advisability of restoring again to the communion of the Church those who had lapsed in time of persecution, agitated the Church in the time of S. Cyprian. Novatian and his fellows, who refused the place of repentance to those who had fallen away, were strongly opposed by him. *Cf.* Epistle LIV. :—

> "It did not seem to be right, or agreeable to fatherly love or divine clemency, that the Church should be shut against such as knock for admission; that the comfort of the hope of salvation should be denied to those who grieve and sue for pardon; and that so they should leave this world, and go to God, without communion and peace with the Church, since our great Lawgiver, as He hath assured us that what is bound on earth shall be bound in heaven, so hath likewise promised that what is first loosed in the Church here, shall also be loosed in heaven"

The Novatians, whose error was revived by some of the sectaries of the Reformation period, are expressly condemned in Article XII. of the AUGSBURG CONFESSION :—

> "Damnantur et Novatiani, qui nolebant absolvere lapsos post baptismum redeuntes ad poenitentiam."

See also SAXON CONFESSION, Article XVI., quoted above p. 107; and *cf.* the HOMILY OF REPENTANCE, p. 568 :—

> "Whereupon we do not without a just cause detest and abhor the damnable opinion of them which do most wickedly go about to persuade the simple and ignorant people, that, if we chance, after we be once come to God, and grafted in His Son Jesus Christ, to fall into some horrible sin, repentance shall be unprofitable to us, there is no more hope of reconciliation, or to be received again into the favour and mercy of God."

We may remark, in conclusion, that the case of S. Peter, as recorded in Holy Scripture, furnishes a good illustration of true doctrine on the points dealt with in our Article. It is manifest from our Lord's words in S. Matt. xvi. 17 that S. Peter had received grace; from this he fell when he denied his Lord, yet was restored and became the leader of the Apostolic band.

ARTICLE XVII

OF PREDESTINATION AND ELECTION.

Predestination to life, is the everlasting purpose of God, whereby (before the foundations of the world were laid) He hath constantly decreed by His counsel secret to us, to deliver from curse and damnation, those whom He hath chosen in Christ out of mankind, and to bring them by Christ to everlasting salvation, as vessels made to honour. Wherefore, they which be endued with so excellent a benefit of God, be called according to God's purpose by His Spirit working in due season; they through grace obey the calling: they be justified freely: they be made sons of God by adoption: they be made like the image of His only begotten Son Jesus Christ: they walk religiously in good works, and at length, by God's mercy, they attain to everlasting felicity.

As the godly consideration of Predestination, and our Election in Christ, is full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort to godly persons, and such as feel in themselves the working of the Spirit of Christ, mortifying the works of the flesh, and their earthly members, and drawing up their mind to high and heavenly things, as well because it doth greatly establish and confirm their faith of eternal salvation to be enjoyed through Christ, as

DE PRAEDESTINATIONE ET ELECTIONE.

Praedestinatio ad vitam, est aeternum Dei propositum, quo (ante jacta mundi fundamenta) suo consilio, nobis quidem occulto, constanter decrevit, eos quos **in Christo** elegit ex hominum genere, a maledicto et exitio liberare, atque (ut vasa in honorem efficta) per Christum ad aeternam salutem adducere: Unde qui tam praeclaro Dei beneficio sunt donati, illi Spiritu ejus opportuno tempore operante, secundum propositum ejus vocantur: vocationi per gratiam parent: justificantur gratis: adoptantur in filios: unigeniti ejus Jesu Christi imagini efficiuntur conformes: in bonis operibus sancte ambulant: et demum ex Dei misericordia pertingunt ad sempiternam felicitatem.

Quemadmodum praedestinationis et electionis nostrae in Christo pia consideratio, dulcis, suavis et ineffabilis consolationis plena est vere piis et his qui sentiunt in se vim Spiritus Christi, facta carnis et membra quae adhuc sunt super terram mortificantem, animumque ad coelestia et superna rapientem, tum quia fidem nostram de aeterna salute consequenda per Christum plurimum stabilit atque confirmat, tum quia amorem nostrum in Deum vehementer accendit: ita hominibus curiosis, carnalibus, et Spiritu

because it doth fervently kindle their love towards God: So, for curious and carnal persons, lacking the Spirit of Christ, to have continually before their eyes the sentence of God's Predestination, is a most dangerous downfall, whereby the devil doth thrust them either into desperation, or into wretchlessness of most unclean living, no less perilous than desperation.

Furthermore, we must receive God's promises in such wise, as they be generally set forth to us in Holy Scripture: and in our doings, that Will of God is to be followed, which we have expressly declared to us in the Word of God.

Christi destitutis, ob oculos perpetuo versari praedestinationis Dei sententiam, perniciosissimum est praecipitium, unde illos diabolus protrudit, vel in desperationem, vel in aeque perniciosam impurissimae vitae securitatem.

Deinde promissiones divinas sic amplecti oportet, ut nobis in sacris literis generaliter propositae sunt: et Dei voluntas in nostris actionibus ea sequenda est, quam in verbo Dei habemus diserte revelatam.

§ 1.—*SOURCE.*

This Article is the composition of the English Reformers.

In the teaching of Luther and those who followed him, the doctrine of Predestination held no very important place; hence in the famous and widely accepted Augsburg Confession, as also in the later Wurtemberg Confession, there is no Article on Predestination. Amongst the Reformed, however, and especially with Calvin, the subject assumed quite a fundamental importance. The intimacy of Cranmer with Bucer, Peter Martyr, and other leading divines belonging to the Swiss or Reformed school accounts for the place given to the treatment of Predestination in our Articles, and it is noteworthy that the language of this seventeenth Article presents a remarkable agreement with the definition of Predestination given by Peter Martyr in his Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans[1] (p. 411, folio ed. 1558):—

> Dico igitur praedestinationem esse sapientissimum propositum Dei, quo ante omnem aeternitatem decrevit constanter, eos quos

[1] It will be remembered that Peter Martyr resided in England for some years (1548–1553) during the reign of Edward VI., and enjoyed close friendship with Archbishop Cranmer. The words quoted above were not published until after he left England, but seem from the Preface to have been written as early as 1552, *i.e.*, about the same time as our Article.

dilexit in Christo, vocare ad adoptionem filiorum, ad justificationem ex fide et tandem ad gloriam per bona opera, quo conformes fiant imagini Filii Dei, utque in illis declaretur gloria et misericordia Creatoris."

At the same time there are in this Article very important differences from the manner of stating the doctrine of Predestination which is found in the formularies of the Swiss school as influenced by Calvin,[1] and in the concluding paragraph (beginning "Furthermore we must receive God's promises") a resemblance may be traced to passages in the writings of Melanchthon.[2]

In the Revision of 1563 two slight changes were made in the text of the Article:—

(i.) The words "**in Christo**" (printed in **thick type** in the Latin Version) were added.

(ii.) In 1553 the last paragraph began thus:—

"Furthermore, although the decrees of predestination are unknowen unto us, yeat we must receive," &c.

This clause was altered to its present form.

§ 2.—*OBJECT.*

The object of those who drew up the Article seems to have been to state, in view of the many altercations on this awful and mysterious subject, the doctrine of Predestination and Election in Scriptural terms, and to guard against the abuse to which it was seen to be liable.

§ 3.—*EXPOSITION.*

(1.) What is to be understood by Predestination and Election.

In the first part of the Article we have simply a statement of the doctrine of Predestination and Election in the phraseology of Scripture, without addition or comment.

Predestination to life, is the everlasting purpose of God, whereby (before the foundations of the world were laid) He hath constantly decreed by His counsel secret to us, (Eph. i. 4, 5, 11; Rom. viii. 28, 29, ix. 11; 2 Thess. ii. 13; 2 Tim. i. 9.)

[1] These important differences will be noted in the Exposition, § 3, below.

[2] Several passages are quoted from Melanchthon by Archbishop Laurence in his Bampton Lectures, p. 179.

to deliver from curse and damnation, (Gal. iii. 13.)

those whom He hath chosen in Christ out of mankind, and to bring them by Christ to everlasting salvation, (Eph. i. 4, 6; 1 S. Pet. i. 2–5.)

as vessels made to honour. (Rom. ix. 21.)

Wherefore they which be endued with so excellent a benefit of God, be called according to God's purpose, by His Spirit working in due season: they through grace obey the calling: (Rom. viii. 28, 30; 2 Thess. ii. 14; 2 Tim, i. 9.)

they be justified freely: (Rom. iii. 24; viii. 30.)

they be made sons of God by adoption: (Eph. i. 5; Gal. iii. 26, iv. 5; Rom. viii. 15.)

they be made like the image of His only-begotten Son Jesus Christ: (Rom. viii. 29; 2 Cor. iii. 18.)

they walk religiously in good works, (Eph. i. 4; 1 Thess. iv. 7.)

and at length by God's mercy they attain to everlasting felicity. (Eph. i. 11; 2 Thess. ii. 14; 1 S. Pet. i. 2–5, v. 10.)

From the first it has been God's purpose to gather a Church out of the world; it is in fulfilment of this purpose that He now sends forth everywhere the preachers of the Gospel and *calls* men into His Church (Rom. i. 6, x. 14, 15; 1 Cor. i. 9; 1 Thess. ii. 12). Those who are thus called by God are regarded as chosen by Him from the mass of mankind, and are spoken of as His *elect* (Rom. viii. 33, xi. 5, 7; Col. iii. 12; 1 Thess. i. 4; Tit. i. 1; 2 Tim. ii. 10; 1 S. Pet., ii. 9).[1] It is simply due to His sovereign will and pleasure that some have the privilege of admission to the Church offered to them, while others have not (Deut. x. 15; Eph. i. 4, 5; 1 S. Pet. ii. 9; and see especially S. Paul's argument in Rom. ix.–xi.). As to those who have not this privilege offered them, we may be sure that they will be judged each one according to his opportunities at the last day (Acts xvii. 31; Rom. ii. 11–16). With regard to those admitted to the Church, every one so elected is *predestinated* to salvation (*cf.* S. John vi. 39), and has power to attain to it. In considering the famous passages in the Epistle to the Romans which are so

[1] The Christian Church has thus succeeded to the privilege of God's ancient people, which is spoken of in the Old Testament as elect. *Cf., e.g.*, Deut. vii. 6; Ps. xxxiii. 12.

often quoted in controversy on the subject of Predestination, we should note:—

(i.) That in viii. 28–30 the verbs *προέγνω, προώρισε, ἐκάλεσε, ἐδικαίωσε, ἐδόξασε*, are all in the past tense. The glory referred to in the last of these is, therefore, not the future glory which those finally saved will enjoy in the world to come, but the present glory of Christians in the Church (*cf.* S. John xvii. 22; Eph. i. 18, ii. 6; Col. i. 26, 27).

(ii.) That the analogy of the potter (ix. 21) does not in reality favour the doctrine it is sometimes quoted to support, since the potter makes no vessels for destruction.

In order that we may understand the relation of the teaching of our Article to other teaching upon the subject, we must observe particularly:—

(*a*) *Nothing is said in the Article about reprobation, or predestination to eternal death.*

In this, as throughout, the Article is strictly on Scriptural lines. The election of some does not imply the final rejection of all the rest. God chooses some, not because He has no regard for those that remain, but in order that, by means of His elect, He may accomplish His good purpose for the whole race (Gen. xii. 1–3, xviii. 18, 19; S. John xv. 16; Rom. xi. 25–32).

On the other hand, the doctrine of Reprobation is an integral part of Calvinism, and its entire omission forbids us to regard the doctrine of Predestination stated in the Article as in any sense Calvinistic.

Calvin's own teaching may be illustrated by one or two quotations:—

Institutes, III. xxi. 5:

> "Praedestinationem vocamus aeternum Dei decretum, quo apud se constitutum habuit, quid de unoquoque homine fieri vellet. Non enim pari conditione creantur omnes; sed aliis vita aeterna, aliis damnatio aeterna praeordinatur. Itaque prout in alterutrum finem quisque conditus est, ita vel ad vitam, vel ad mortem praedestinatum dicimus."

Again, III. xxiii. 1:

> "Multi quidem ac si invidiam a Deo repellere vellent, electionem ita fatentur ut negant quenquam reprobari: sed inscite nimis et pueriliter, quando ipsa electio nisi reprobationi opposita non staret. Dicitur segregare Deus quos adoptet in salutem; fortuito alios

adipisci, vel sua industria acquirere, quod sola electio paucis confert, plusquam insulse dicetur. Quos ergo Deus praeterit, reprobat; neque alia de causa nisi quod ab haereditate quam filiis suis praedestinat, illos vult excludere."

With our Article we may contrast the following statements of Calvinistic formulæ:—

French Confession, Art. XII.:

"Credimus ex hac corruptione et damnatione universali, in qua omnes homines natura sunt submersi, Deum alios quidem eripere . . . alios vero in ea corruptione et damnatione relinquere."

Lambeth Articles, I.:

"Deus ab aeterno praedestinavit quosdam ad vitam, et quosdam ad mortem reprobavit."

Canons of Dort, "De Divina Praedestinatione," Art. VI.:

"Atque hic potissimum sese nobis aperit profunda, misericors pariter et justa hominum aequaliter perditorum discretio: sive decretum illud electionis et reprobationis in verbo Dei revelatum."

(*b*) *Nothing is said in the Article about the motive or cause of Predestination.*

According to Calvinism, the moving cause of Predestination, as also of Reprobation, is God's absolute will, irrespective of anything in those predestinated.

Calvin's Institutes, III. xxi. 5.:

"Eam (scil. praedestinationem) multis cavillis involvunt, praesertim vero qui praescientiam faciunt ejus causam."

Cf. III. xxii. 11:

"Ergo si non possumus rationem assignare cur suos misericordia dignetur, nisi quoniam ita illi placet: neque etiam in aliis reprobandis aliud habebimus quam ejus voluntatem."

See also the second quotation given under the heading (*a*) above.

Lambeth Articles, II.:

"Causa movens aut efficiens praedestinationis ad vitam non est praevisio fidei aut perseverantiae, aut bonorum operum, aut ullius rei quae insit in personis praedestinatis, sed sola voluntas beneplaciti Deo."

Canons of Dort, "De Divina Praedestinatione," Art. IX.:

"Eadem haec electio facta est non ex praevisa fide, fideique obedientia, sanctitate, aut alia aliqua bona qualitate et dispositione,

tanquam causa seu conditione in homine eligendo praerequisita, sed ad fidem, fideique obedientiam, sanctitatem." . . .

Art. X.:

"Causa vero hujus gratuitae electionis est solum Dei beneplacitum."

Westminster Confession, X. 2.:

"This effectual call is of God's free and special grace alone, not from anything at all foreseen in man."

According to Arminianism, on the other hand, the decree of Predestination is not arbitrary, but in consequence of God's foreknowledge that those predestinated will respond to His call and make good use of the grace given to them.

Cf. the Confession of the "Remonstrants," xvii. 3:

"Est vocatio efficax ab eventu potius, quam a sola intentione Dei sic dicta, quae scilicet effectum suum salutarem reipsa sortitur, non quidem idcirco, quod ex praecisa salvandi intentione per singularem et arcanam quandam Dei sapientiam sic administretur, ut fructuose congruat voluntati ejus, qui vocatur, neque quod in ea efficaciter per potentiam irresistibilem aut vim quantam omnipotentem voluntas ejus, qui vocatur, ad credendum ita determinetur, ut non possit non credere et obedire." . . .

In the view of both Calvinists and Arminians election is considered to be to final glory, and by the elect are meant, therefore, *those eventually saved.* But, as we have seen, according to Scripture teaching, which our Article simply affirms, election is to membership in the Church, and the elect are therefore *the baptized.*[1] This is certainly the view of our Church in her public offices and in the Catechism. See the Baptismal Office, where we pray that the child about to be baptized "may ever remain in the number of God's faithful and *elect* children;" and again, in the Rubric at the end of the same service, we are assured, "It is certain by God's word that children which are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved." So, too, in the Church Catechism the baptized person is taught to express his belief in the Holy Ghost, Who sanctifieth him "and all the *elect people* of God."

[1] The baptized in general are constantly spoken of as "the elect" in the Letter of S. Clement of Rome to the Corinthians, the Epistles of S. Ignatius, and in the "Shepherd" of Hermas.

With this doctrine of our Church the Calvinistic belief stands in sharp contrast, as expressed, *e.g.*, in the WESTMINSTER CONFESSION, X. 4:—

> "Others not elected, although they may be called by the ministry of the word, and may have some common operations of the Spirit, yet they never truly come unto Christ, and therefore cannot be saved."

(2.) PRACTICAL RESULTS OF THE CONSIDERATION OF PREDESTINATION.

(*a*) For the godly.

The godly consideration of Predestination, and our Election in Christ, is full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort to godly persons, and such as feel in themselves the working of the Spirit of Christ, mortifying the works of the flesh, and their earthly members, and drawing up their mind to high and heavenly things,

The consideration of God's Predestination and Election is thus full of comfort for His people, because—

(i.) **it doth greatly establish and confirm their faith of eternal salvation to be enjoyed through Christ, as because**

(ii.) **it doth fervently kindle their love towards God.**

(*b*.) For the ungodly.

For curious and carnal persons, lacking the Spirit of Christ, to have continually before their eyes the sentence of God's Predestination, is a most dangerous downfall,

The compilers of the Article here evidently have in view the evil consequences which were seen to follow in some cases upon the consideration of the doctrine of Predestination as it was often taught and understood at the time.

whereby the devil doth thrust them either

(i.) **into desperation, or**

(ii.) **into wretchlessness**[1] **of most unclean living, no less perilous than desperation.**

Calvin himself admits that his doctrine of Predestination lies open to similar objection. See *e.g.*, INSTITUTES, III. xxiii. 12:

> "Hoc quoque ad evertendam praedestinationem exagitant, quod ipsa stante, concidat omnis solicitudo, et bene agendi

[1] *I.e.*, recklessness. *Cf.* Jewel's "Apology," Part I. cap. 3, § 5:

> "For men to be careless about what is spoken by them and their own matter . . . is the part, doubtless, of dissolute and wretchless persons."

studium. . . . Ita omnes projicient se, et deploratum in morem, quocunque libido tulerit praecipites ibunt. Et sane non in universum mentiuntur."

Cf. III. xxiv. 4:

"Et vero licet, periculosi maris instar habeatur praedestinationis disputatio; patet tamen in ea lustranda tuta et pacata, addo et jucunda navigatio, nisi quis periclitari ultro affectet. Nam quemadmodum in exitialem abyssum se ingurgitant, qui ut de sua electione fiant certiores, aeternum Dei consilium sine verbo, percontantur: ita qui recte atque ordine ipsam investigant qualiter in verbo continetur, eximium inde referunt consolationis fructum."

(3.) The Doctrine of Individual Predestination repudiated. **Furthermore, we must receive God's promises in such wise, as they be generally set forth to us in Holy Scripture:** (See S. John iii. 16; 1 Tim. ii. 4, 6.)

The meaning is that we must receive God's promises as they are set forth to us, viz., as applying to the 'genus humanum,' and not to some favoured individuals only.[1]

Cf. the wording of His Majesty's Declaration prefixed to the Articles in 1628:—

"That therefore in these both curious and unhappy differences, which have for so many hundred years, in different times and places, exercised the Church of Christ, we will, that all further curious search be laid aside, and these disputes shut up in God's promises, as they be generally set forth to us in the Holy Scriptures."

See also Reformatio Legum, "De Haeresibus," Cap. 22:—

"Quapropter omnes nobis admonendi sunt, ut in actionibus suscipiendis ad decreta praedestinationis se non referant, sed universam vitae suae rationem ad Dei leges accomodent; cum et promissiones bonis, et minas malis, in Sacris Scripturis generaliter propositas contemplentur."

In the light of this last paragraph, we should not omit to notice the manner in which the doctrine is stated in the first part of the Article. Predestination is there declared to be

[1] For the use of the adverb *generally* in the Article, *cf.* Church Catechism:

"*Q.* How many Sacraments hath Christ ordained in His Church?
A. Two only, as generally necessary to salvation." . . .

See also 2 Sam. xvii. 11; Jer. xlviii. 38.

"*the purpose of God whereby . . . He hath constantly decreed . . . to deliver from curse, &c., . . . and to bring . . . to eternal salvation,*" not individuals separately, but a certain class of persons as Christians collectively, "**those whom He hath chosen in Christ out of mankind.**"

Calvin's manner of stating the doctrine of Predestination should be carefully compared with this, and the vital difference will at once appear. See, *e.g.*, INSTITUTES, III. xxi. 5 :—

> "Praedestinationem vocamus aeternum Dei decretum, quo apud se constitutum habuit quid *de unoquoque homine* fieri vellet.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> "Itaque prout in alterutrum finem *quisque* conditus est, ita vel ad vitam vel ad mortem praedestinatum dicimus."

Again, III. xxi. 7 :—

> "Quanquam satis liquet Deum occulto consilio libere quos vult eligere, aliis rejectis, nondum tamen nisi dimidia ex parte exposita est gratuita ejus electio, donec *ad singulas personas* ventum fuerit."

Further, in III. xxiv. 1 Calvin expressly says :—

> "Aliquid disserui eorum errorem refellens, quibus generalitas promissionum videtur aequare totum humanum genus."

In this connection it is instructive to note that in the General Confession prefixed in 1552 to the Order for Morning and for Evening Prayer, which was based on a form composed in French by Calvin, the clause "According to Thy promises *declared unto mankind* in Christ Jesu our Lord" was added by our English Reformers.[1]

The Article concludes :—

And in our doings that Will of God is to be followed, which we have expressly declared to us in the Word of God.

Cf. REFORMATIO LEGUM, "De Haeresibus," Cap. 22 :—

> "Debemus enim ad Dei cultum viis illis ingredi, et in illa Dei voluntate commorari, quam in Sacris Scripturis patefactam esse videmus."

This last clause of the Article is manifestly directed against those who held that, besides the revealed will of God (*cf.* 1 Tim.

[1] *Cf.* Article VII. :—

> "Per Christum qui unicus est Mediator Dei et hominum Deus et homo, aeterna vita *humano generi* est proposita."

ii. 4), there is also His secret will according to which He has elected only a few.

A few quotations may be given to indicate the position taken up by the Church of Rome in the controversy on the subject of Predestination. The COUNCIL OF TRENT (Session VI.) decreed: —

> "Nemo quoque, quamdiu in hac mortalitate vivitur, de arcano divinae praedestinationis mysterio usque adeo praesumere debet, ut certo statuat se omnino esse in numero praedestinatorum; quasi verum esset, quod justificatus aut amplius peccare non possit, aut si peccaverit, certam sibi resipiscentiam promittere debeat: nam nisi ex speciali revelatione, sciri non potest quos Deus sibi elegerit."

Cf. Canon XVII. of the same session: —

> "Si quis justificationis gratiam non nisi praedestinatis ad vitam contingere dixerit, reliquos vero omnes, qui vocantur, vocari quidem, sed gratiam non accipere, utpote divina potestate praedestinatos ad malum: anathema sit."

ARTICLE XVIII

OF OBTAINING ETERNAL SALVATION ONLY BY THE NAME OF CHRIST.

They also are to be had accursed, that presume to say, that every man shall be saved by the Law or Sect which he professeth, so that he be diligent to frame his life according to that Law, and the Light of Nature. For Holy Scripture doth set out unto us only the Name of Jesus Christ, whereby men must be saved.

DE SPERANDA AETERNA SALUTE TANTUM IN NOMINE CHRISTI.

Sunt et illi anathematizandi qui dicere audent, unumquemque in lege aut secta quam profitetur, esse servandum, modo juxta illam et lumen naturae accurate vixerit: cum sacrae literae tantum Jesu Christi nomen praedicent, in quo salvos fieri homines oporteat.

§ 1.—*SOURCE.*

Composed by the English Reformers, 1552–3.

§ 2.—*OBJECT.*

The Article is directed against the theory of certain Anabaptists, that as long as people were conscientious in following out their own systems, it was a matter of no significance whether they accepted or rejected the Gospel of Christ. This error is referred to in the REFORMATIO LEGUM, "De Haeresibus," Cap. 11 :—

> "Horribilis est et immanis illorum audacia qui contendunt in omni religione vel secta, quam homines professi fuerint, salutem illis esse sperandam, si tantum ad innocentiam et integritatem vitae pro viribus enitantur juxta lumen, quod illis praelucet a natura infusum. Auctoritate vero sacrarum literarum confixae sunt hujusmodi pestes. Solum enim et unicum ibi Jesu Christi nomen nobis commendatum est, ut omnis ex eo salus ad nos perveniat."

§ 3.—*EXPOSITION.*

(1.) LATITUDINARIANISM ANATHEMATISED.

They also are to be had accursed (sunt anathematizandi), that presume to say, that every man shall be saved by the Law or

Sect which he professeth, so that he be diligent to frame his life according to that Law, and the Light of Nature.

The present Article alone of all the thirty-nine contains an anathema. The only error, therefore, *expressly anathematised* by our Church is the Latitudinarian spirit, which finds its logical basis in the denial of all objective truth, going upon the supposition either that there is no such thing as Revelation, or that all religions are equally acceptable to God; the spirit which asks, 'What does it matter what a man believes, so long as he lives a good life according to his light?' and to which Pope has given expression in the oft-quoted lines:—

> "For modes of faith let graceless zealots fight;
> His can't be wrong whose life is in the right."

But all experience goes to show that conduct in the long-run corresponds with belief. Conduct depends upon Creed; thought lies at the foundation of action, and no structure of just deeds can be safely built unless the underlying thought be sound and firm. Thus in the CHURCH CATECHISM that which is to be believed is taught before anything is said of that which is to be done, and the ATHANASIAN CREED plainly declares:—

> "Quicunque vult salvus esse:
> Ante omnia opus est ut teneat catholicam fidem."[1]

This brings us to the second part of our Article:—

(2.) THERE IS ONLY ONE TRUE RELIGION, ONE WAY OF SALVATION, VIZ., THAT EMBODIED IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST.

For Holy Scripture doth set out unto us only the Name of Jesus Christ, whereby men must be saved. (See Acts iv. 12; S. John xiv. 6; 1 S. John v. 11, 12.)

Mankind falls into two great divisions:—

(*a*) Those who have the Gospel offered to them in this life.

(*b*) Those who have not this offer.

Taking (*a*) the case of those who have the offer of the Gospel,

[1] *Cf.* the words which occur in the decree on Original Sin of the COUNCIL OF TRENT (Session V.):—

> "Ut fides nostra catholica sine qua impossibile est placere Deo . . . permaneat."

we meet with no difficulty. Those who deliberately reject the one way of salvation do so at their peril (S. Mark xvi. 16).

When, however, we come to consider (*b*) the case of those who have not the offer of the Gospel in this life, a difficulty arises, because the wording of the Article might seem to imply that all heathen, &c., must necessarily perish eternally, even though they had striven to live a good life according to their light. But there are several passages of Scripture—*e.g.*, Rom. ii. 12–16; Acts x. 34, 35—which show us that people who make the best use they can of the light given to them will be judged according to it; that God will in no case require more than He has given (S. Luke xii. 48). What is most needful for us to keep in mind is that, whether in this life men hear of Christ or not, it is only through His meritorious work that they can be pardoned and saved; His Sacrifice is the only Sacrifice for sin. We must recognise, then, the existence of objective truth; that Christ's work has an objective value for men, apart from our individual appreciation of it. His Sacrifice accomplished something for us before it was presented to us as an object of faith; it effected something for mankind (1 S. John ii. 2); the subjective impression on man's heart is an after-thing, following upon faith in that eternal work. Thus the Church believes that faithful Jews who lived under the Old Dispensation are saved, and that "baptized infants dying before they commit actual sin are undoubtedly saved."[1] Neither of these classes can in this life have had explicit knowledge about Christ, yet His work avails for them. So, too, with the heathen, the good are saved, not by the Law or Sect which they profess, but by the work of Christ. The overlooking of the Intermediate State,[2] which is only too common amongst us, tends very much to cripple our Theology when dealing with questions such as the present. May it not be that after death righteous heathen have opportunity of accepting what Christ has done for them, and of coming to the knowledge of Him, Whose work had availed for them during their life on earth, while yet they knew Him not?

It is not the case, then, that man is free to choose a religion for himself, as though all were equally true. There is only one true religion—that of Jesus Christ. It is the firm conviction of this that has made the Church from the very first a *missionary* institution, not content that Christianity should take a place as

[1] See Rubric at the close of the Office for the Public Baptism of Infants.
[2] *Cf.* Art. XXVI. of the SECOND HELVETIC CONFESSION, quoted, p. 151.

one amongst many religions of the world, but seeking, according to her Lord's command, to embrace within her fold "every creature" (S. Mark. xvi. 15). This action she takes because, as members of the Church, we are brought into Covenant with God, wherein His grace is pledged to us and His promises made; of these, therefore, we may have the certainty upon our performing the conditions of the Covenant. Those outside the Covenant cannot have this same assurance.

It cannot, surely, be thought a matter of little importance whether men accept the Gospel and become members of the Church or not, when we remember what great pains God is represented in Scripture as taking in order to bring men into the Church, rather than save them outside it. See S. Matt. xi. 11; Acts ii. 47; and note especially the case of Cornelius, who, though accepted by God as a Gentile (Acts x. 34, 35), yet is brought into the Church (Acts xi. 13, 14).

[In the XLII. Articles of 1553 here followed the Article on the binding force of the Moral Commandments:—

ALL MEN ARE BOUNDE TO KEPE THE MORAL COMMAUNDEMENTES OF THE LAWE.

The Lawe, whiche was geuen of God by Moses, although it binde not Christian menne, as concerning the Ceremonies, and Rites of the same: Neither is it required, that the Ciuile Preceptes and Ordres of it shoulde of necessitie bee receiued in any commune weale: Yet no manne, (bee he neuer so perfeicte a Christian) is exempte and lose from the Obedience of those Commaundementes, whiche are called Moral. Wherfore thei are not to be harkened vnto, who affirme that holie Scripture is geuen onlie to the weake, and do boaste theimselues continually of the spirit, of whom (thei sai) thei haue learned soche things as thei teache, although the same be most euidently repugnaunt to the holie Scripture.

OMNES OBLIGANTUR AD MORALIA LEGIS PRAECEPTA SERVANDA.

Lex a Deo data per Mosen, licet quoad caerimonias et ritus Christianos non astringat, neque civilia ejus praecepta in aliqua republica necessario recipi debeant, nihilominus ab obedientia mandatorum quae Moralia vocantur nullus, quantumvis Christianus est solutus. Quare illi non sunt audiendi, qui sacras literas tantum infirmis datas esse perhibent, et spiritum perpetuo jactant, a quo sibi quae praedicanto suggeri asserunt, quanquam cum sacris literis apertissime pugnent.

The Article was struck out from this place in 1563, but the first part of it, down to the words "which are called Moral," was at the same time added to Article VII. (where see notes). That the second part, which condemns an error of the Anabaptists, was altogether omitted in 1563 may be taken as indicating that, during the ten years which had elapsed since the Article was originally framed, Anabaptist opinions had receded very much into the background, so that there was not the same necessity that the Church should expressly condemn them. Other changes made in 1563 point in the same direction:—

(i.) The words "et hodie Anabaptistae repetunt" were omitted from Article IX.

(ii.) The Article "De Gratia" of 1553, which condemned extravagant Anabaptist opinions, was altogether omitted.

(iii.) The Article on "Heretickes called Millenarii" of 1553 was also omitted.]

ARTICLE XIX

OF THE CHURCH.

The Visible Church of Christ, is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly ministered, according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.

As the Church of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch have erred: so also the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith.

DE ECCLESIA.

Ecclesia Christi visibilis est coetus fidelium, in quo verbum Dei purum praedicatur, et Sacramenta, quoad ea quae necessario exiguntur, juxta Christi institutum recte administrantur.

Sicut erravit Ecclesia Hierosolymitana, Alexandrina et Antiochena: ita et erravit Ecclesia Romana, non solum quoad agenda et caerimoniarum ritus, verum in his etiam quae credenda sunt.

§ 1.—*SOURCE.*

Composed by the English Reformers, 1552–3. With the first part of the Article we may compare the definition of the Church given in the AUGSBURG CONFESSION, Part I. Art. VII.:—

> "Est autem ecclesia congregatio sanctorum, in qua evangelium recte docetur, et recte administrantur sacramenta."

§ 2.—*OBJECT.*

This Article was doubtless drawn up with a twofold object:—

(*a*) To make clear what we are to understand by the Church, some definition on this point being especially necessary at the time of the Reformation, when visible unity with Rome had been broken.

(*b*) In view of the breach with Rome, to justify the action of the Church of England by recording the conviction that the Church of Rome had erred in matters of faith.

§ 3.—*EXPOSITION.*

(1.) The Church is Visible.

We should first note that the Article speaks of **the Visible Church of Christ.** All that is laid down in the Articles with reference to the Church applies to the Visible Church, and nothing is anywhere said of an invisible Church. Here, as throughout, our Articles are strictly Scriptural. No distinction is drawn by the New Testament writers between a visible and an invisible Church, but the Church appears in the Apostolic Epistles as a visible society, with its rite of admission (Baptism), its rules and organisation; a body which may be known and observed of all men. That Christ Himself intended to found a Church in the sense of a visible society, and not merely in that of an invisible aggregation of pious souls, known only to God, is indicated by:—

(*a*) *His method;* which was not to scatter His teaching haphazard over the world, for men to make what they could of it, but to train an organised body of disciples, who should preach the Gospel and admit others to their fellowship (S. Matt. xxviii. 19; *cf.* Acts ii. 41, 42, 47).

(*b*) *His institution of certain corporate acts as Sacraments.*

(i.) Baptism, a ceremony not new in itself, but understood by the Jews at the time as instituting into the visible society of God's people.

(ii.) The Holy Eucharist, which is essentially a corporate action.

(*c*) *His teaching; e.g.,* on the subject of the Kingdom of God. It should be noted, too, that our Lord's Prayer, recorded in S. John xvii. 21, 22, implies a visible unity of His followers.

The definitions of the Church given in the Lutheran formularies agree with that of our Article.

See Augsburg Confession, Part I. Art. VII., quoted in § 1 above.

See also Saxon Confession, Art. XII.:—

> "Dicimus igitur Ecclesiam visibilem in hac vita coetum esse amplectentium Evangelium Christi, et recte utentium sacramentis."

Cf. Art. XV. of the same Confession:—

> "Vult enim Deus conspici aut audiri suam ecclesiam in mundo, et vult sejunctam esse multis publicis signis a reliquis gentibus."

The formularies of the Swiss School of Reformers, on the other hand, draw the distinction between the Visible and the Invisible Church, and speak of the true Church as invisible.

Scotch Confession, Art. XVI.:

"Sicut in unum Deum Patrem, Filium et Spiritum Sanctum credimus, ita etiam ab initio fuisse et nunc esse, Matt. iii. 9, et in consummationem usque mundi futuram unam Ecclesiam constanter credimus, id est, societatem et multitudinem hominum a Deo electorum. . . . Haec ecclesia est invisibilis, soli Deo nota, qui solus novit, quos elegit."

Second Helvetic Confession, Art. XVII.:

"Unde et ecclesia invisibilis appellari potest, non quod homines sint invisibiles, ex quibus ecclesia colligitur, sed quod oculis nostris absconsa, Deo autem soli nota, judicium humanum saepe subterfugiat."

Westminster Confession, XXV. 1, 2:

"The catholick or universal church, which is invisible, consists of the whole number of the elect that have been, are, or shall be gathered into one, under Christ the head thereof. . . . The visible church, which is also catholick or universal under the gospel, . . . consists of all those throughout the world that profess the true religion, together with their children."

See also the Second Baptist Confession, Art. XXVI.:—

"The Catholic or Universal Church, which (with respect to the internal work of the Spirit and truth of grace) may be called invisible, consists of the whole number of the elect."

(2.) The Visible Church is the Congregation of the Faithful.

The Visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men,

By 'congregation' (cœtus) is here meant, not a body of people assembled in one place, but the whole number of God's people. In this sense the same Latin word is used in the Vulgate; see, *e.g.*, Exod. xii. 19, "Qui comederit fermentatum, peribit anima ejus de cœtu Israel."

By 'faithful men' are meant believers in Jesus Christ.

(3.) Two Notes of the Church are given.

(i.) **in the which the pure word of God is preached, and**

(ii.) **the Sacraments be duly ministered, according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.**

In the XI. Articles of 1559 three notes of the Church are given:—

> "I do acknowledge also that Church to be the spouse of Christ, wherein the word of God is truly taught, the Sacraments orderly ministered according to Christ's institution, and the authority of the keys duly used" (Article III.).

Cf. the HOMILY FOR WHITSUNDAY, 2nd part, pp. 494, 495:—

> "The true Church is an universal congregation or fellowship of God's faithful and elect people, built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the head corner-stone. And it hath always three notes or marks, whereby it is known: pure and sound doctrine, the Sacraments ministered according to Christ's holy institution, and the right use of ecclesiastical discipline." [*I.e.*, as explained in the context—"the authority of the keys to excommunicate notorious sinners, and to absolve them which are truly penitent."]

The same three notes of the Church are given in the Ordinal:—

> *The Bishop.* Will you then give your faithful diligence always so to minister the Doctrine and Sacraments, and the Discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded, &c.?
> *Answer.* I will do so, by the help of the Lord.

Two only of these three notes or marks are expressly mentioned in the present Article:—

(*a*) *The Preaching of the pure Word of God.* (See Rom. x. 17; 2 Tim. iv. 2.)

We must distinguish the Word preached from the Word written, *e.g.*, in the passage of 2 Tim. just referred to "the Word" cannot, of course, signify "the Bible." By "the Word of God," the preaching of which is a note of the Church, we must understand the great doctrines of the Church with reference to the Person and Work of our Lord Jesus Christ (Acts xiii. 26; *cf.* 1 Cor. xv. 1–4), which were embodied at a very early time in short dogmatic statements, and formed the nucleus of our Creeds. We have frequent allusions in the New Testament to the body of sound doctrine entrusted to the keeping of the Church, and which she proclaims to men (1 Tim. i. 10, vi. 3; 2 Tim. i. 13, iv. 3; Tit. i. 9, 13, ii. 1, 2). It is with reference to this that we pray in the Ordination Service, "Replenish them with the truth of Thy doctrine," and that the Bishop, in the same service,

gives to each ordained priest the charge, "Take thou authority to preach the Word of God."

This body of doctrine, which it is one of the marks of the Church to hand on unimpaired, is not, of course, to be in any way set against the Bible. The WORD PREACHED and the WORD WRITTEN should always go together. Thus, when the Bishop says the words above quoted, he delivers the Bible at the same time to the newly ordained priest. In order that Church doctrine may be handed on unimpaired constant reference should be made to Scripture, which is the standard of doctrine. (See Article VI.).

The Church is first, then, a *Dogmatic Institution*, a preacher of doctrine.

(*b*) *The due ministration of the Sacraments.*

Steadfastness in Sacraments is necessary as well as steadfastness in doctrine (Acts ii. 42; Eph. iv. 5). Next to the teaching office of the Church comes the ministerial. *Cf.* the charge in the Ordinal to which reference has already been made—"Take thou authority to preach the Word of God, and to minister the holy Sacraments in the congregation."

The Church system is thus *Sacramental* as well as Dogmatic. In the Article emphasis is laid on the due administration of the Sacraments "according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same."

The requisites are:—

(i.) In Baptism—

Water.

The formula, "In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."[1] (See S. Matt. xxviii. 19).

(ii.) In the Holy Communion—

The elements of Bread and Wine.

The recital of Christ's words of Institution.

A duly ordained minister (so our Church provides in the Ordinal).[2]

The Notes of the Church given in the Article—the Preaching of the Word and the due administration of the Sacraments—

[1] That both water and the words are considered essential to the Sacrament by the Church is clear from the questions asked when a child is received who has been privately baptized:—"With what matter was this child baptized?" "With what words was this child baptized?"

[2] With our Church's requirement that the Sacraments are to be administered "according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are re-

demand a *Ministry*, carrying with it the idea of Church order and discipline. The third note of the Church, as stated in the Homilies and the Ordinal, is thus implied, though not expressly stated, in our Article.

The following extracts on the Notes of the Church may be compared (in addition to the passages already quoted from the Augsburg and Saxon Confessions):—

Reformatio Legum, "De Haeresibus," Cap. 21:

> "Nos enim eam quae cerni potest Ecclesiam sic definimus, ut omnium cœtus sit fidelium hominum, in quo Sacra Scriptura sincere docetur, et sacramenta (saltem his eorum partibus quae necessariae sunt) juxta Christi praescriptum administrantur."

First Helvetic Confession, Art. XV.:

> "Quae quidem quum solius sit dei oculis nota, externis tamen quibusdam ritibus, ab ipso Christo institutis, et verbo dei velut publica legitimaque disciplina, non solum cernitur cognosciturque, sed ita constituitur, ut in hanc sine his nemo (nisi singulari dei privilegio) censeatur."

Calvin's Institutes, IV. 1, 9:

> "Ubicumque enim Dei verbum sincere praedicari atque audiri, ubi sacramenta ex Christi instituto administrari videmus, illic aliquam esse Dei Ecclesiam nullo modo ambigendum est."

Scotch Confession, Art. XVIII.:

> "Notas ergo verae Ecclesiae Dei credimus, confitemur, et profitemur, primum et ante omnia, veram praedicationem Verbi Dei, in quo Deus seipsum nobis patefecit, sicut Prophetarum et Apostolorum scripta nobis declarant. . . . Deinde recta Sacramentorum Jesu Christi administratio, quae verbo et promissioni Dei annecti debent, ut illud in cordibus nostris confirment et obsignent. Postremo loco est disciplina Ecclesiastica recte administrata, sicut Dei verbum praescribit ad reprimendum vitium et virtutem fovendam."

---

quisite to the same," contrast what is laid down in The Chief Principles of the Christian Religion as professed by the People called Quakers:—

(*a*) Concerning Baptism.

> "As there is one Lord, and one faith, so there is one baptism . . . and this baptism is a pure and spiritual thing, to wit, the Baptism of the Spirit, and fire."

(*b*) Concerning the Communion, or Participation of the Body and Blood of Christ.

> "The communion of the Body and Blood of Christ is inward and spiritual . . . of which things the breaking of bread by Christ with His disciples was a figure which they even used in the Church for a time, who had received the substance, for the cause of the weak."

(4.) Local Churches are liable to Error, and have erred. **As the Church of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch have erred: so also the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith.**

The Church as a whole has the promise of Divine guidance, and that the gates of hell shall not prevail against her (S. John xvi. 13; S. Matt. xvi. 18); she is the pillar and ground of the truth (1 Tim. iii. 15). The several parts of the Church, however, are singly liable to error, and have in fact erred. See, *e.g.*, in the New Testament, the letters to the Seven Churches of Asia in Rev. ii., iii.

In the present Article:—

(*a*) First, the patriarchates of the Eastern Church are named as having erred. It is not clear what errors are referred to, the statement of the Article being quite general; perhaps the denial of the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Second Person in the Holy Trinity may be intended.

(*b*) But the real point of this part of the Article, doubtless, is the expression of the conviction that the Church of Rome has erred. In this case, again, the statement is quite general, and should be understood as referring to the Mediæval corruptions which were a principal cause of the breach with Rome in the sixteenth century.

We may compare Reformatio Legum, "De Haeresibus," Cap. 21:—

> "Etiam illorum insania legum vinculis est constringenda, qui Romanam Ecclesiam in hujusmodi petra fundatam esse existimant, ut nec erraverit, nec errare possit; cum et multi possint ejus errores ex superiore majorum memoria repeti, et etiam ex hac nostra proferri, partim in his quibus vita nostra debet informari, partim etiam in his quibus fides debet institui."

ARTICLE XX

OF THE AUTHORITY OF THE CHURCH.

The Church hath power to decree Rites or Ceremonies, and authority in controversies of Faith: and yet it is not lawful for the Church to ordain anything that is contrary to God's Word written, neither may it so expound one place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to another. Wherefore, although the Church be a witness and keeper of Holy Writ: yet, as it ought not o decree anything against the same, so besides the same, ought it not to enforce anything to be believed for necessity of salvation.

DE ECCLESIAE AUCTORITATE.

Habet Ecclesia Ritus sive Ceremonias statuendi jus, et in fidei controversiis auctoritatem: quam vis Ecclesiae non licet quicquam instituere, quod Verbo Dei scripto adversetur, nec unum Scripturae locum sic exponere potest, ut alteri contradicat. Quare licet Ecclesia sit divinorum Scriptorum testis et conservatrix, attamen ut adversus eos nihil decernere, ita praeter illos nihil credendum de necessitate salutis debet obtrudere.

§ 1.—*SOURCE.*

Composed by the English Reformers. In 1553, and in the first draft of 1563, the Article began with the words, "It is not lawful for the Church to ordain," &c. ("Ecclesiae non licet quicquam instituere"). The important clause at the beginning (in **thick type** in the Latin) appears in the Latin edition of 1563 as expressly sanctioned by the Queen; and the Article, with this clause added, was approved by Convocation, ratified by the Crown, and enforced by Parliament in 1571. The Wurtemburg Confession may have been the model from which the new clause was taken. *Cf.* the Article "De Ecclesia":—

> "Credimus et confitemur . . . quod haec Ecclesia habeat jus judicandi de omnibus doctrinis . . . quod haec Ecclesia habeat jus interpretandae Scripturae. . . . Quare et Ecclesia sic habet auctoritatem judicandi de doctrinis, ut tamen contineat se intra metas Sacrae Scripturae, quae est vox sponsi sui, a qua voce nulli, ne angelo quidem, fas est recedere."

§ 2.—*OBJECT.*

The object of the Article in its present form seems to be to guard against—

(*a*) Undue exaggeration of the authority of the Church on the one hand, and

(*b*) Undue depreciation of that same authority on the other.

§ 3.—*EXPOSITION.*

(1.) The Authority of the Church.

The Church hath power (jus) to decree Rites or Ceremonies, and authority in controversies of Faith.

This Article stands in close relation to the preceding. The Church being a visible society of men, Divinely organised, it follows that there must be an inherent power of ordering whatever is necessary for the corporate life of her members; like other societies, she must have authority to enact and enforce the rules which her members are bound to observe. Thus—

(*a*) The Church has the right of decreeing forms of worship and rites or ceremonies, wherewith to consecrate, or to celebrate, events in the lives of her children.

(*b*) Moreover, since controversies on matters of faith are constantly liable to occur, she must have power to settle points of dispute which may arise from time to time.

That the Church has this twofold authority is affirmed in our Article.

(*a*) By the power which she has to decree rites or ceremonies, the Church ensures that all things are done, in accordance with the Apostolic precept, "decently and in order" (1 Cor. xiv. 40). The custom of the "churches of God" is quoted by S. Paul as deciding a controverted ceremonial matter (1 Cor. xi. 16). We may add that Christ Himself recognised the right of the Jewish Church to ordain ceremonies when He bade His disciples observe and do the things commanded by those who sat in Moses' seat (S. Matt. xxiii. 2, 3); and when He expressly declared that while the great Moral Commandments of the Law have the first claim, yet, at the same time, the ceremonial precepts of the Church should not be passed over (S. Matt. xxiii. 23).

(*b*) We have already seen that to the Church as a whole the Lord has given the promise that she shall be led into all truth (S. John xvi. 13); she is the pillar and ground of the truth (1 Tim. iii. 15); she has, therefore, authority to determine doctrine. The authority attaching to decisions of the Church is stated by our Lord Himself (S. Matt. xviii. 17); and we may see examples of the exercise of that authority in the New Testament; *e.g.*, when disputes arose concerning circumcision and other matters, the question, which agitated the whole Christian community, and in which the freedom of the Gospel was involved, was decided by a decree of the Church, after a representative Council held at Jerusalem (Acts xv. 19–29). See also the charges given by S. Paul to Timothy and Titus respectively, which imply an authority of the Church in matters of faith (1 Tim. i. 3; Tit. iii. 10). It is on the principle that the Church has such authority that Creeds and Formularies of Faith have in all ages been constructed and promulgated.

(2.) The Authority of the Church limited by Holy Scripture.

The Divinely inspired Scriptures are entrusted, not to the individual, but to the Church, which is **a witness and keeper of Holy Writ.** (*Cf.* Rom. iii. 2.)

(i.) The Church is a witness, inasmuch as in her life, as the visible Kingdom of Christ on earth, she testifies to the truth of His Gospel and His promises; she lets her light shine before men in defence and confirmation of the Gospel.

(ii.) The Church is also the keeper of Holy Writ; she hands on from age to age the Sacred Books, promulgating them as the Word of God in succeeding generations, and guarding them from corruption or perversion.

In Holy Scripture we have the infallible truth of God, but we, in our apprehension of it, are fallible; how, then, can we guard against receiving it wrongly? In order that Divine truth, as embodied in Holy Scripture, may pass into the minds of men, that same Holy Spirit, Who inspired Scripture, is Himself given to the Church to lead and guide into all truth (S. John xvi. 13).

It is not lawful for the Church to ordain anything that is contrary to God's Word written.

(*a*) *As regards Rites or Ceremonies.*

These must not be contrary to Scripture, but at the same time it is not necessary that they should have the express authority of Scripture.

The Church hath power to decree Rites or Ceremonies, . . . yet . . . it ought not to decree anything against the same (viz., Holy Writ).

Cf. what is laid down in Article XXXIV. :—

> "Traditions and ceremonies . . . may be changed according to the diversities of countries, times, and men's manners, so that nothing be ordained against God's Word."

Thus, *e.g*, the use of the surplice in Divine Service, and of the sign of the Cross in Baptism, are Ceremonies decreed by the Church, and not contrary to Holy Scripture, although, at the same time, neither have they direct Scriptural sanction.

(*b*) *With regard to Doctrine.*

In this case it is necessary that what is laid down by the Church should have the express authority of Scripture.

The Church hath . . . authority in controversies of Faith : . . . yet . . . besides the same (viz., Holy Writ) **ought it not to enforce anything to be believed for necessity of salvation.**

Our Article further makes it clear what is meant when it is said that doctrine laid down by the Church should have the express warrant of Scripture ; it is meant, not that a text or two must be found to support it, but that the Church must see that such doctrine is consistent with the whole tenor of Scripture.

neither may it so expound one place of Scripture that it be repugnant to another.

On the subject dealt with in this Article the words of the Creed of Pope Pius IV. should be compared :—

> "Apostolicas et ecclesiasticas traditiones, reliquasque ejusdem Ecclesiae observationes et constitutiones firmissime admitto, et amplector.
>
> "Item sacram Scripturam juxta eum sensum, quem tenuit et tenet sancta mater Ecclesia, cujus est judicare de vero sensu et interpretatione sacrarum Scripturarum, admitto, nec eam unquam nisi juxta unanimem consensum Patrum accipiam, et interpretabor."

Two incidental, but significant, points should be noted in the above extract:—

(i.) "Ecclesiastical traditions" have the first place, being mentioned before the Holy Scripture.

(ii.) While of the former it is said "*firmissime* admitto," with regard to Holy Scripture the formula used is simply "admitto."

See also the decree of the COUNCIL OF TRENT, "De Canonicis Scripturis" (Session IV.):—

> "Synodus . . . orthodoxorum patrum exempla secuta, omnes libros tam Veteris, quam Novi Testamenti, cum utriusque unus Deus sit auctor, nec non traditiones ipsas, tum ad fidem, tum ad mores pertinentes, tanquam vel ore tenus a Christo, vel a Spiritu Sancto dictatas, et continua successione in ecclesia catholica conservatas, pari pietatis affectu et reverentia suscipit et veneratur."

ARTICLE XXI.

OF THE AUTHORITY OF GENERAL COUNCILS.

General Councils may not be gathered together without the commandment and will of Princes. And when they be gathered together (forasmuch as they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed with the Spirit and Word of God) they may err, and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining unto God. Wherefore things ordained by them as necessary to salvation, have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be declared that they be taken out of Holy Scripture.

DE AUCTORITATE CONSILIORUM GENERALIUM.

Generalia Concilia sine jussu et voluntate principum congregari non possunt, et ubi convenerint, quia ex hominibus constant, qui non omnes Spiritu et Verbo Dei reguntur, et errare possunt, et interdum errarunt, etiam in his quæ ad normam pietatis pertinent: ideoque quæ ab illis constituuntur, ut ad salutem necessaria, neque robur habent, neque auctoritatem, nisi ostendi possint e sacris literis esse desumpta.

§ 1.—*SOURCE.*

Composed by the English Reformers, 1552–3.

§ 2.—*OBJECT.*

To assert the sole right of the Civil Power to call General Councils, and to express the conviction that some of the Councils, which were at the time commonly reputed General Councils, had fallen into error.

§ 3.—*EXPOSITION.*

(1.) General Councils.

This Article is closely related to the preceding. In Article XX. it is laid down that the Church has authority in controversies of Faith; the present Article is concerned with General Councils, by which the Church exercises that authority, for they

are an important stage in the process by which the judgment of the Church on matters of Faith has been ascertained. In order that a Council may be ranked as a General Council it is necessary that two main conditions should be fulfilled; it should be—

(*a*) *Representative* of the Church at large; and

(*b*) *Free; i.e.*, there must be no constraint placed upon the members by any civil or spiritual ruler, or by any faction within the Church itself.

The real test, however, of the œcumenicity of a Council consists in the reception of such Council and its work by every portion of the Church. The Divine Spirit is promised to the whole Church, and the consentient witness of the whole Church is therefore necessary. If this principle be kept in mind, deference to the decisions of General Councils is quite intelligible; the actual deliberations of Synods may perhaps be marked by polemics and by bitterness of tone, but they are the regular machinery for registering the agreement of the Church, and their authority only becomes decisive after their verdict has been accepted by the Church at large. Their decisions, therefore, in the result, represent, not the tyranny of chance majorities, but the working out in balanced formulae of complex Scriptural truth.

The opinion of our English Reformers with regard to General Councils may be illustrated from the REFORMATIO LEGUM, "De Summa Trinitate et Fide Catholica," Cap. 14:—

> "Nam quaedam illorum, qualia sunt praecipua illa quatuor, Nicenum, Constantinopolitanum primum, Ephesinum et Chalcedonense, magna cum reverentia amplectimur et suscipimus. Quod quidem judicium de multis aliis quae postea celebrata sunt ferimus, in quibus videmus et confitemur sanctissimos patres de beata et summa Trinitate, de Jesu Christo Domino et Servatore nostro, et humana redemptione per eum procurata, juxta Scripturas divinas multa gravissime et perquam sancte constituisse. Quibus tamen non aliter fidem nostram obligandam esse censemus, nisi quatenus ex Scripturis sanctis confirmari possint. Nam concilia nonnulla interdum errasse, et contraria inter sese definivisse, partim in actionibus juris, partim etiam in fide, manifestum est."

Cf. also STAT. 1 ELIZABETH, c. 1, quoted under heading (5.) below.

The opinion of both Saxon and Swiss schools of Reformers may be gathered from the following extracts: [1]—

Hermann's Consultatio:

"Which thinges nevertheless we set furth to be receyued and obserued of men committed to our charge, none otherwise than as a beginninge of so holie and necessary a thinge, until a general reformacion of congregacions be made by the holie empire, by a fre and Christian council vniuersall or national."

Wurtemburg Confession, Art. XXXIV., "De Conciliis":

"Fatemur sua debere esse in Ecclesia de dogmatis et sacris judicia, et magnam esse legitimorum Conciliorum auctoritatem. Sed longe omnium maxima sit auctoritas verbi Dei necesse est. . . . Testantur quoque exempla, non Pontifices tantum, sed etiam Concilia erasse."

Scotch Confession, Art. XX.:

"Quemadmodum non temere damnamus illud quod viri pii, congregati in generali concilio legitime convocato, nobis proposuerunt; ita sine justo examine non admittimus quicquid hominibus, generalis concilii nomine obtruditur: manifestum enim est, quod sicut fuerunt homines, ita etiam eorum quidam manifeste errarunt, idque in rebus maximi ponderis et momenti. Quatenus ergo concilium, sententiam et mandatum quod dat, probat plano Dei verbo, eatenus statim idipsum reveremur et amplectimur."

Second Helvetic Confession, Art. II.:

"Quapropter non patimur nos in controversiis religionis vel fidei causis urgeri nudis Patrum sententiis, aut conciliorum determinationibus, multo minus receptis consuetudinibus, aut etiam multitudine idem sententium, aut longi temporis praescriptione. Ergo non alium sustinemus in causa fidei judicem, quam ipsum Deum per Scripturas sanctas pronunciantem, quid verum sit, quid falsum, quid sequendum sit, quidve fugiendum."

Cf. the Declaration of the Faith, Church Order, and Discipline, of the Congregational or Independent Dissenters. "Principles of Church Order and Discipline," § 2:

"They believe that the New Testament contains, either in the form of express statute or in the example and practice of the Apostles and Apostolic Churches, all the Articles of Faith necessary to be believed, and all the principles of order and discipline requisite for constituting and governing Christian societies; and that human traditions, fathers and councils, canons and creeds, possess no authority over the faith and practice of Christians."

[1] Luther himself appealed more than once to a future General Council.

(2.) General Councils should be summoned by the Civil Power.

General Councils may not be gathered together without the commandment and will of Princes.

Cf. a letter of Cranmer to Melanchthon dated Lambeth, March 27, 1552:—

> "I could wish, therefore, that those who excel others in erudition and judgment should be assembled together, after the example of the Apostles, and declare their judgment, as well respecting other subjects of dispute, as likewise especially respecting this controversy, and attest their agreement by some published document. But you will perhaps say, 'And I also have often expressed the same wish; but this matter cannot be effected without the aid of princes.' I have therefore [consulted with][1] the king's majesty, who places his kingdom of England at your disposal, and most graciously promises, not only a place of security and quiet, but also his aid and assistance towards these godly endeavours."—*Original Letters*, vol. i. p. 26.

Under the Roman Empire large bodies of bishops would not have been allowed to assemble from all parts without the sanction of the civil power, and at the present time, when the time-honoured intimate relation between Church and State is still, in many nations, maintained, the statement of the Article holds good. There can be no doubt, however, that the union between Church and State is loosening all over Christendom, and in the event of its being everywhere dissolved, the commandment and will of Princes would have no concern with the Councils of the Church.[2]

(3.) General Councils may err, and sometimes have erred.

And when they be gathered together (forasmuch as they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed with the Spirit and Word of God) they may err, and sometimes have erred,

[1] One or more words are here wanting in the original.

[2] Some of the Reformers were inclined to give a much more prominent position to the civil power in the Councils of the Church than our Article affirms. See, *e.g.*, Westminster Confession, XXIII. 3:—

> "The civil magistrate may not assume to himself the administration of the word and sacraments, or the power of the keys of the kingdom of heaven; yet he hath authority, and it is his duty, to take order, that unity and peace be preserved in the Church, that the truth of God be kept pure and entire, that all blasphemies and heresies be suppressed, all corruptions and abuses in worship and discipline prevented or reformed, and all the ordinances of God duly settled, administered, and observed. For the better effecting whereof, he hath power to call synods, to be present at them, and to provide that whatsoever is transacted in them be according to the mind of God."

even in things pertaining unto God (in his quae ad normam pietatis pertinent).

The words of the Article are strictly true, as the evidence of history shows; *e.g.*:—

(*a*) The Council of Ariminum, A.D. 359, at which about 400 bishops were present, secured a temporary triumph for Arianism.

(*b*) A Council was held at Ephesus A.D. 449, the violent and disorderly proceedings of which gained for it from Pope Leo the title of 'Latrocinium' (*i.e.*, Ruffian-synod), by which it is commonly known. It pronounced in favour of Eutychianism.

These were fairly representative Councils, but are not, of course, reckoned as General Councils, because their decisions have not been accepted by the Church at large. The infallibility of a Council can never be guaranteed at the moment, but the test of the value of its decisions is, as we have seen, their after-reception by the Church.

The object which the compilers of our Article here had in view seems to have been to record the conviction that some of those Councils which were commonly spoken of in the Western Church at the time as "General Councils" had erred, "in his quae ad normam pietatis pertinent;" thus:—

(i.) The Fourth Lateran Council (1215) had laid down the doctrine of Transubstantiation.

(ii.) The Council of Constance (1414) had withheld the cup from the laity in the Holy Eucharist.

(4.) DECISIONS OF COUNCILS AS TO THINGS NECESSARY TO SALVATION MUST BE FOUNDED ON SCRIPTURE.

Wherefore things ordained by them as necessary to salvation, have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be declared that they be taken out of Holy Scripture.

A General Council is summoned to declare what has always been the Faith, not to propound a new faith. The Faith has been once for all delivered (S. Jude 3), and is enshrined in Holy Scripture, which is thus the Church's standard of doctrine; nothing may, therefore, be taught as an article of Faith unless it be traceable to Holy Scripture. Our Church is here simply to carry out the great Reformation principle which has been already laid down—that "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation." (See Article VI., and notes there.)

(5.) Table of Councils accounted Œcumenical.

A.D.	325. Nicæa (1).	A.D.	1215. Lateran (4).
	381. Constantinople (1).		1245. Lyons (1).
	431. Ephesus.		1274. Lyons (2).
	451. Chalcedon.		1311. Vienne.
	553. Constantinople (2).		1409. Pisa.
	681. Constantinople (3).		1414–18. Constance.
	787. Nicæa (2).		1430. Basle. Removed to Florence.
	869. Constantinople (4).		1512. Lateran (5).
	1123. Lateran (1).		1545–63. Trent.
	1139. Lateran (2).		1869. Vatican.
	1179. Lateran (3).		

All these Councils are recognised as General Councils by the Church of Rome.

The English Reformers reverently accepted the first four. See the extract from the Reformatio Legum quoted above (under heading (1) of this section), and *cf.* Stat. 1 Elizabeth, c. 1, by which it is determined that nothing shall be henceforth accounted heresy but that which has been so adjudged,

> "By the authority of the Canonical Scriptures, or by the first four General Councils, or any of them, or by any other General Council, wherein the same was declared heresy by the express and plain words of the said Canonical Scriptures."

The Act has been repealed, but the words quoted may be taken as indicating the mind of the Reformers. The second and third Councils of Constantinople merely confirmed decrees of the preceding General Councils; hence they also may be considered as recognised by the English Church.

The Orthodox Eastern Church acknowledges the first seven Councils in the list given above as Œcumenical Councils. *Cf.* the 'Holy Catechism' by Bernadaces, p. 16:—

Q. What is an Œcumenical Council?

A. An assembly of the holy fathers and teachers of the Church from all parts of the world to inquire and decide concerning questions of the Christian Faith.

Q. How many Œcumenical Councils of this sort have there been?

A. Seven, and the first of them composed the Creed.

The authorities of the Eastern Church were also willing to recognise the sessions at Florence, which were a continuation of the Council opened at Basle (1430).

It will have been already gathered from the examples we have given that the formularies which give expression to the views of the Swiss School of Reformers do not assign a very high value to the decisions of Councils. The very important and widely approved SECOND HELVETIC CONFESSION, however, in Article XI., holds to the first four Councils :—

> "Et ut paucis multa hujus causæ dicamus, quæcunque de incarnationis Domini nostri Jesu Christi mysterio definita sunt ex Scripturis sanctis, et comprehensa symbolis ac sententiis quatuor primarum et præstantissimarum Synodorum, celebratarum, Niceæ, Constantinopoli, Ephesi et Chalcedone, una cum beati Athanasii symbolo, et omnibus his similibus symbolis, credimus corde sincero, et ore libero ingenue profitemur, condemnantes omnia his contraria."

ARTICLE XXII

OF PURGATORY.

The Romish doctrine concerning Purgatory, Pardons, Worshipping and Adoration as well of Images, as of Reliques, and also Invocation of Saints, is a fond thing, vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God.

DE PURGATORIO.

Doctrina **Romanensium** de Purgatorio, de Indulgentiis, de veneratione et adoratione tum imaginum tum reliquiarum, nec non de Invocatione Sanctorum, res est futilis, inaniter conficta, et nullis Scripturarum testimoniis innititur, imo verbo Dei contradicit.

§ 1.—*SOURCE.*

Composed by the English Reformers. In 1553 the Article began with the words "Scholasticorum doctrina"—"the doctrine of the Scholeaucthoures." The phrase "doctrina Romanensium"[1] was substituted for this in 1563.

Another change was also made in the wording of the Article at the revision in 1563. The adverb "pernitiose," which stood before the verb "contradicit" in the Latin text of 1553, was struck out.

§ 2.—*OBJECT.*

To repudiate the teaching of the Church of Rome on the heads named in the Article. It should be remembered, however, that the decree of the Council of Trent which deals with the subjects treated of in this Article bears date December 4, 1563, so that the framers of our Article (1553) could not have had this in their mind, but were rather referring to the current corrupt teaching of the Latin Church in the times immediately preceding the Reformation. This is, indeed, sufficiently indicated by the wording of the original Article, which speaks of "the doctrine of the School-

[1] The words 'Romanenses' and 'Romanistae' occur as early as 1520, being used by Luther, and by Ulrich von Hutten (the author of the 'Epistolae Obscurorum Virorum'), to designate the extreme Mediæval party.

authors." The change of this expression to "Romish doctrine" in the Elizabethan revision is significant; it was doubtless made because our Reformers were realising that the Church of Rome, at the Council of Trent, was adopting the teaching of the later Schoolmen as its own. The decrees of the Council upon the particular subjects in hand could not, however, have been before the revisers at the time when the change in the wording of our Article was made.

§ 3.—*EXPOSITION.*

This Article condemns the Romish doctrine on the following heads, as not satisfying the test which has been already laid down, viz., that doctrine decreed by the Church must have the warrant of Holy Scripture. On the contrary, it is affirmed of the doctrine here dealt with, that **it is a fond thing, vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God.**

(1.) PURGATORY.

The doctrine of Purgatory depends upon the distinction between the temporal and the eternal punishment of sin, to which every man is liable. It is held that God does indeed, for the sake of the merits and intercession of our Lord Jesus Christ, pardon sin, and at the same time remit the eternal punishment due to it. The sinner is, however, still liable to temporal punishment,[1] which he must expiate by acts of penance in this life. Whatever is not expiated in this life must be expiated after death; the soul, therefore, continues to bear, in the next world, the temporal punishment of its sins. In order to shorten this purgatorial punishment, the prayers and supererogations of men on earth, and especially the offering of masses, are of great efficacy. Such is the "Romish doctrine," which led to serious results both in practice and doctrine. The souls of those that depart hence in the Lord are conceived as lying in flames, enduring torments equal to those of the lost, for a longer or shorter period between death and the day of judgment.[2] Their friends on earth may obtain mitigation of their

[1] The Council of Trent (Session XIV.) declares:—

"Falso omnino esse et a verbo Dei alienum, culpam a Domino nunquam remitti, quin universa etiam poena condonetur."

Cf. Canon XIII. on the Sacrament of Penance (the same Session):—

"Si quis dixerit . . . fictionem esse, quod, virtute clavium sublata poena aeterna, poena temporalis plerumque exsolvenda remaneat, anathema sit."

[2] 1 Cor. iii. 11–15 is sometimes quoted in support of this.

punishment by prayers, and by paying the priest to say mass for their souls; hence arose a most shameful traffic in holy things. Serious doctrinal consequences also followed. Purgatory was often so taught as to invalidate the power of the Passion of Christ, and to imply that there is an expiatory virtue in human suffering and merit;[1] so much sin must be atoned for by just so much suffering, either inflicted upon the sinner by God, or voluntary penal visitations upon himself, or possibly the balance may have to be made up from the supererogatory works of saints. It is this popular doctrine of Purgatory which is justly condemned in our Article.

The Council of Trent affirmed the doctrine of Purgatory, but at the same time made an attempt to clear away abuses connected with it. See Session XXV. (December 1563):—

> "Cum Catholica ecclesia, a Spiritu Sancto edocta ex sacris litteris et antiqua patrum traditione, in sanctis conciliis et novissime in hac oecumenica synodo docuerit, purgatorium esse, animasque ibi detentas fidelium suffragiis potissimum vero acceptabili altaris sacrificio juvari, praecipit sancta synodus episcopis, ut sanam de purgatorio doctrinam, a sanctis patribus et sanctis conciliis traditam, a Christi fidelibus credi, teneri, et ubique praedicari diligenter studeant: apud rudem vero plebem difficiliores ac subtiliores quaestiones, quaeque ad aedificationem non faciunt, et ex quibus plerumque nulla fit pietatis accessio, a popularibus concionibus secludantur; incerta item, vel quae specie falsi laborant, evulgari ac tractari non permittant; ea vero, quae ad curiositatem quandam aut superstitionem spectant vel turpe lucrum sapiunt, tanquam scandala et fidelium offendicula prohibeant."

We must not, of course, understand that when the compilers of our Article censured 'the Romish doctrine of Purgatory,' they at the same time intended to reject the doctrine of the Primitive Church concerning the Intermediate State. Those who depart this life in a state of grace go to be with Christ (Phil. i. 23), and pass into a state of blessed rest and peace (Rev. xiv. 13);[2]

[1] The Council of Trent saw the danger involved, and attempted to guard against it:—

> "Accedit, quod dum satisfaciendo patimur pro peccatis, Christo, qui pro peccatis nostris satisfecit, conformes efficimur. . . . Neque vero ita nostra est satisfactio haec, quam pro peccatis nostris exsolvimus, ut non sit per Christum; nam qui ex nobis tanquam ex nobis nihil possumus, eo co-operante omnia possumus. Ita non habet homo unde glorietur, sed omnis gloriatio nostra in Christo est" (Session XIV.).

[2] *Cf.* the words of the prayer in the Burial Service:—

> "Almighty God, with Whom do live the spirits of them that depart hence in the Lord, and with Whom the souls of the faithful, after they are delivered from the burden of the flesh, are in joy and felicity."

but we must not conceive of them as altogether inactive, or as though asleep;[1] the work of grace, begun in this life, goes on in their souls, they attain to higher and higher degrees of perfection, till at last they will, with joy, behold the Face of God in Heaven. It is obvious that in many at the time of their departure from this life there is much good, mingled with much evil as yet unsubdued. We cannot for a moment think of such as lost souls; neither, on the other hand, can we imagine them as fitted, at the moment of death, for the Beatific Vision of Heaven. Should we not, therefore, conclude that the good work begun in them will be continued in the waiting state beyond the grave, the evil being, by the continued operation of the Spirit of God, purged away, till they too are fitted, with all saints, to behold the Face of God with joy?

Further, we should not forget that the members of Christ who have departed this life are still, by virtue of the common union with the living Lord, in close communion with us on earth; the Church Militant here and the Church Expectant in Paradise are vitally and indivisibly one, so that our brethren who have been taken from us into Paradise still have their part in the mutual offices of the members of the One Body. Of all the mutual helps we enjoy in the Body of Christ, there is nothing that binds us so closely to one another as the ministry of prayer. We pray continually for those we love in Christ while they are living here, and natural impulse and deep instinct of piety alike prompt us to continue to pray for them when they have passed from our sight to join the waiting Church beyond the grave.

[1] This error was revived by some at the Reformation period, and was expressly condemned by the 40th of the XLII. ARTICLES of 1553:—

THE SOULLES OF THEM THAT DEPARTE THIS LIFE DOE NEITHER DIE WITH THE BODIES, NOR SLEEP IDLIE.	DEFUNCTORUM ANIMAE NEQUE CUM CORPORIBUS INTEREUNT, NEQUE OTIOSE DORMIUNT.
Thei whiche saie that the soulles of suche as departe hens doe sleepe, being without al sence, fealing, or perceiuing vntil the daie of iudgement, or affirme that the soulles die with the bodies, and at the laste daie shalbe raised vp with the same, doe vtterlie dissent from the right beliefe declared to vs in holie Scripture.	Qui animas defunctorum praedicant usque ad diem judicii absque omni sensu dormire, aut illas asserunt una cum corporibus mori, et extrema die cum illis excitandas, ab orthodoxa fide, quae nobis in sacris litteris traditur, prorsus dissentiunt.

See also REFORMATIO LEGUM, 'De Haeresibus,' Cap. 12:

> "Quidam impie philosophantur animas hominum ex hac vita migrantium, quando semel ex corporibus excesserunt, usque ad supremum ultimi judicii tempus, vel somno involvi, vel prorsus ad nihilum recidere; tum autem cum extremi judicii dies erit, illas rursus vel a somno excitari, vel cum propriis corporibus ab interitu resurgere."

There is abundant evidence which goes to prove that the practice of Prayer for the Dead prevailed in the Primitive Church.[1]

(*a*) The ancient Liturgies all contain commemoration of and intercession for the departed. A few quotations are here given:—

The Greek Liturgy of S. James of Jerusalem[2]:

> Μνήσθητι, Κύριε ὁ Θεός, τῶν πνευμάτων καὶ πάσης σαρκός, ὧν ἐμνήσθημεν, καὶ ὧν οὐκ ἐμνήσθημεν, ὀρθοδόξων, ἀπὸ Ἄβελ τοῦ δικαίου μέχρι τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας· αὐτὸς ἐκεῖ αὐτοὺς ἀνάπαυσον ἐν χώρᾳ ζώντων, ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ σου, ἐν τῇ τρυφῇ τοῦ παραδείσου, ἐν τοῖς κόλποις Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ, τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων ἡμῶν. ὅθεν ἀπέδρα ὀδύνη λύπη καὶ στεναγμός· ἔνθα ἐπισκοπεῖ τὸ φῶς τοῦ προσώπου σου καὶ καταλάμπει διὰ παντός.

The Clementine Liturgy[3]:

> Ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐν πίστει ἀναπαυσαμένων δεηθῶμεν.

S. Cyril of Jerusalem, in his Lectures on the Mysteries[4] (v. 9), thus speaks:

> Εἶτα μνημονεύομεν καὶ τῶν προκεκοιμημένων, πρῶτον, πατριαρχῶν, προφητῶν, ἀποστόλων, μαρτύρων, ὅπως ὁ θεὸς ταῖς εὐχαῖς αὐτῶν καὶ πρεσβείαις προσδέξηται ἡμῶν τὴν δέησιν· εἶτα καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν προκεκοιμημένων ἁγίων πατέρων καὶ ἐπισκόπων καὶ πάντων ἁπλῶς τῶν ἐν ἡμῖν προκεκοιμημένων, μεγίστην ὄνησιν πιστεύοντες ἔσεσθαι ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὑπὲρ ὧν ἡ δέησις ἀναφέρεται τῆς ἁγίας καὶ φρικωδεστάτης προκειμένης Θυσίας.

The Greek Liturgy of S. Mark[5]:

> Τούτων πάντων τὰς ψυχὰς ἀνάπαυσον, Δέσποτα Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν ἐν ταῖς τῶν ἁγίων σου σκηναῖς, ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ σου, χαριζόμενος αὐτοῖς τὰ τῶν ἐπαγγελιῶν σου ἀγαθά.[6]

---

[1] We may refer to 2 Tim. i. 16–18 as indicative of Apostolic practice. It is generally agreed by commentators that Onesiphorus, for whom S. Paul there prays, was dead at the time when the Epistle was written. *Cf.* iv. 19, where it is noteworthy that greeting is sent, not to Onesiphorus himself, but to his household.

[2] Dating from the earlier part of the fourth century, and adopted throughout the patriarchate of Antioch.

[3] Embodied in the Apostolical Constitutions, and dating, perhaps, from the middle of the third century.

[4] Delivered about the middle of the fourth century.

[5] This dates very probably from the fourth century, and was used in the patriarchate of Alexandria.

[6] There can be no doubt that the custom of Prayer for the Dead passed from the Jewish to the Christian Church. 2 Macc. xii. 39–45 testifies to the use of prayers for the dead amongst the Jews about two centuries before our Lord's

(*b*) Inscriptions in the Catacombs also afford valuable incidental testimony to the practice of the primitive Christians, and show us that in early times death was not conceived as forming a barrier to the prayers which the living offered for their loved ones who had gone before.

Typical examples of such inscriptions are the following:—

(i.) KALIMERE DEUS REFRIGERET SPIRITUM TUUM UNA CUM SORORIS TUAE HILARE.

(ii.) DOMINE NE QUANDO ADUMBRETUR SPIRITUS VENERES DE FILIUS IPSEIUS QUI SUPERSTITIS SUNT BENIROSUS PROJECTUS.

(iii.) ERENEA VIVAS IN DEO. A. Ω.

That our Reformers did not intend in the present Article to censure the Primitive practice of Prayer for the Dead will appear more clearly if we attentively consider the history of the text of the Article itself. The leading divines of our Church in Edward VI.'s reign[1] were apparently divided on the question. Some of those who had come more immediately under the influence of the Swiss school of Continental Reformers[2] condemned the practice of praying for the dead, and classed it with Mediæval corruptions which should be swept away.[3] This view of the matter prevailed in the first draft of the Article as it stood in October 1552, when the text ran thus:—"Scholasticorum doctrina de Purgatorio, *de precatione pro defunctis*," &c.; but the

coming; and we are assured by the most competent Jewish scholars that during the time of our Lord's earthly ministry prayers for the dead were continually offered in the synagogue services, as they still are to-day. Sacrifices were also offered in the Temple for the departed, and vicarious ablutions undertaken by the living on behalf of those who had died while in a condition of ceremonial defilement (*cf.* 1 Cor. xv. 29). Our Lord Himself during His sojourn upon earth, and His Apostles too, who were loyal observers of the traditions of their fathers, must often have joined in prayers for the departed.

[1] The earlier English formularies, issued in the reign of Henry VIII., had commended the practice. See, *e.g.*, the KING'S BOOK:—

> "And truly it standeth with the very order of charity, a Christian man to pray for another, both quick and dead, and to commend one another in their prayers to God's mercy, and to cause other to pray for them also, as well in masses and exequies" (Formularies of Faith, p. 375).

[2] The line taken up by the Swiss school of Reformers may be gathered from the SECOND HELVETIC CONFESSION, Art. XXVI.:—

> "Credimus enim fideles recta a morte corporea migrare ad Christum, ideoque viventium suffragiis aut precibus pro defunctis, denique illis suis officiis nihil indigere. Credimus item infideles recta praecipitari in Tartara, ex quibus nullus impiis aperitur, ullis viventium officiis, exitus."

[3] Thus in the ninth of a series of Articles drawn up by Bishop Hooper we find that "the doctrine of the schoolmen of purgatory, pardons, prayers for them that are departed out of this world," are alike condemned.

words italicised were deliberately struck out before the Articles were published.[1]

(2.) Pardons, or Indulgences.

The theory of Indulgences was so uncertain that in 1552 the Cardinals dissuaded Pope Adrian VI. from issuing any decree on the subject. It is said that they grew out of what was originally a remission, either wholly or in part, of ecclesiastical censures or dispensation from ecclesiastical rules of discipline. Pope Urban II. (1088) granted 'Indulgence' to all who fought for the Holy Sepulchre. His successors extended this to all who, not being able to go in person, maintained a soldier to go in their place. At a later period this was extended by Innocent III. to those who joined in crusade against heretical Christians. Pope Julius II., in order to raise money for rebuilding S. Peter's at Rome, published 'Indulgences' to all who would make contributions, a practice which was continued by his successor, Leo X. As regards the popular doctrine of Indulgences, the distinction between the temporal and eternal punishment due to sin, which underlies the doctrine of Purgatory, underlies it also. The superabundant merits of Christ and the supererogatory works of the Saints form a sort of treasury of merit, upon which the Pope may draw, and apply it to individual Christians for the remission of such temporal punishments and penances for sin as remain to be inflicted after the sins themselves and their eternal punishment have been remitted.

Bellarmine gives expression to the "Romish doctrine" of Indulgences censured by our Article:—

> "Ecclesia et scholae theologorum indulgentias vocant remissiones poenarum, quae saepe remanent eluendae post remissionem

[1] We may here note that in two passages in the Communion Service we have regard to the departed.

(i.) We commemorate the faithful dead in the Prayer for the Church Militant:—

> "And we also bless Thy holy Name for all Thy servants departed this life in Thy faith and fear; beseeching Thee to give us grace so to follow their good examples, that with them we may be partakers of Thy heavenly kingdom."

(ii.) In the prayer of Oblation we beseech—

> "That by the merits and death of Thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in His blood, we and all Thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of His passion."

The phrase "all Thy whole Church," taken in its full and proper sense, includes those members waiting in Paradise.

culparum et reconciliationem in sacramento poenitentiae adeptam, quas remissiones summi pontifices ex paterna lenitate . . . certis temporibus, et non sine justa aliqua et rationabili causa concedere solent" (De Indulgentiis, I. Cap. 1).

"Exstat in ecclesia thesaurus satisfactionum ex Christi passionibus infinitus, qui nunquam exhauriri poterit. . . . Ad hunc thesaurum superfluentium satisfactionum pertinent etiam passiones beatae Mariae virginis et omnium aliorum sanctorum, qui plus passi sunt, quam eorum peccata requirerent" (Ibid., Cap. 2).

"Indulgentia proprie est absolutio judiciaria, annexam habens solutionem ex thesauro" (Ibid., Cap. 5).

"Per indulgentias non tollitur nisi reatus poenae temporalis, qui remanet culpa dimissa. . . . Indulgentiae liberant homines a reatu poenae non solum coram ecclesia, sed etiam coram Deo" (Ibid., Cap. 7).

"Res certissima est, et apud Catholicos indubitata, indulgentiis juvari posse animas, quae in purgatorio poenas luunt" (Ibid., Cap. 14).

The Council of Trent on this subject decreed (Session XXV.) as follows:—

"Synodus indulgentiarum usum, christiano populo maxime salutarem et sacrorum conciliorum auctoritate probatum, in ecclesia retinendum esse docet et praecipit; eosque anathemate damnat, qui aut inutiles esse asserunt, vel eas concedendi in ecclesia potestatem esse negant. In his tamen concedendis moderationem juxta veterem et probatam in ecclesia consuetudinem adhiberi cupit, ne nimia facilitate ecclesiastica disciplina enervetur. Abusus vero, qui in his irrepserunt, quorum occasione insigne hoc indulgentiarum nomen ab haereticis blasphematur, emendatos et correctos cupiens, praesenti decreto generaliter statuit, pravos quaestus omnes pro his consequendis, unde plurima in christiano populo abusuum causa fluxit, omnino abolendos esse."

Thus, while the Council affirmed that the Church has the power to grant Indulgences, and that the use of them is salutary, it at the same time strongly condemned abuses connected with them, and made a real attempt at reform in the matter. Since the sale of Indulgences was, on any theory, an abuse, the office of quæstor was abolished by the Council.

(3.) The Worshipping and Adoration of Images.

It is only too true that in the times preceding the Reformation there was a great deal of superstitious veneration, and even actual worship of images in and for themselves. This our Church strongly

and justly condemns. We have the express word of God on the subject in the Second Commandment, which directly forbids us to make any graven image for the purpose of worshipping it.

The Council of Trent (Session XXV.) speaks somewhat guardedly with reference to the honour to be paid to images:—

> "Imagines porro Christi, deiparae virginis et aliorum sanctorum in templis praesertim habendas et retinendas, eisque debitum honorem et venerationem impertiendam, non quod credatur inesse aliqua in iis divinitas vel virtus, propter quam sint colendae, vel quod ab eis sit aliquid petendum, vel quod fiducia in imaginibus sit figenda, veluti olim fiebat a gentibus, quae in idolis spem suam collocabant: sed quoniam honor, qui eis exhibetur, refertur ad prototypa, quae illae repraesentant: ita ut per imagines, quas osculamur, et coram quibus caput aperimus et procumbimus, Christum adoremus, et sanctos, quorum illae similitudinem gerunt, veneremur."[1]

The teaching of schoolmen and great divines of the Roman Church, however, certainly comes under the condemnation of our Article; *e.g.*—

(*a*) Thomas Aquinas declares that the same reverence should be displayed towards an image of Christ, and towards Christ Himself; and seeing that Christ is adored with the adoration of latria,[2] it follows that His image is to be adored with the adoration of latria.[3]

(*b*) Bellarmine (De Imaginibus, II. Cap. 21) writes as follows:—

> "Imagines Christi et sanctorum venerandae sunt, non solum per accidens vel improprie, sed etiam per se et proprie, ita ut ipsae terminent venerationem ut in se considerantur, et non solum ut vicem gerunt exemplaris."

As to the usage of the Primitive Church, the Christians of the first ages, through fear of idolatry, did not use images of Christ, but only emblematical representations, such as the Lamb and the Good Shepherd, besides the sign of the Cross. In the time of

[1] The Council recognised the prevalence of abuses in connection with images by taking measures for reform in the matter:—

> "Omnis porro superstitio in Sanctorum invocatione, Reliquiarum veneratione, et imaginum sacro usu tollatur: omnis turpis quaestus eliminetur, omnis denique lascivia vitetur: ita ut procaci venustate imagines non pingantur nec ornentur, et Sanctorum celebratione, ac Reliquiarum visitatione homines ad comessationes atque ebrietates non abutantur."

[2] λατρεία is the technical term for the highest kind of veneration or worship, due to God alone, as distinct from δουλεία, which may be rendered to creatures.

[3] Summa Theologiae, III. xxv.

Gregory the Great (*i.e.*, at the close of the sixth century) the custom of setting up representations of sacred subjects in churches had become common, and we find that Pope advocating the continuance of the custom for the better instruction of the minds of the ignorant. The Eastern Church was agitated by a keen controversy on the subject of images during the eighth century, which issued in the decrees of the Second Council of Nicæa (787). It was then decided that the sign of the Cross, and images of our Lord, the Blessed Virgin, saints, and angels, might be set up in churches.[1]

The proper and edifying use of images and pictures is not condemned by our Article. As Gregory the Great says, "It is one thing to worship an image, quite another thing to learn by it what is to be worshipped;" and it cannot be denied that images and pictures are of very great value in keeping great truths or facts continually before the minds of Christian people. The deplorable ignorance of very large numbers in this country concerning the fundamentals of our most holy Religion is doubtless owing, to a very considerable extent, to the neglect by our Church of that most effective method of teaching—by the eye. The strong language of the Homilies against images was justified by the circumstances of the time, but is felt to be not altogether applicable to the conditions of to-day. Recent restorations in our churches have furnished us with beautiful representations of the infant Christ in the arms of the Blessed Virgin, of the Crucifixion, and of our Lord in glory. Thus the great foundation truths of the Incarnation and the Atonement, together with the glorious issue of our Religion, the glorification of humanity in Christ upon the Divine Throne in Heaven, are constantly set forth before all.

How far images or pictures may be safely introduced into churches without danger of idolatry is a question that may be left to the discretion of the Church in each age and country.

The reaction from the Mediæval abuse of images led some of the Reformers on the Continent, especially those of the Swiss school,[2] not merely to condemn the abuse of images, but to altogether exclude and forbid any use of them.

[1] In the Eastern Church at the present day all statues and carved images are rigidly excluded from churches, the Second Commandment being adhered to in its strictly literal sense. Painted representations of our Lord, of the Mother of God, and of the Saints, called Icons, are, however, retained, and play a very important part in the devotions of the faithful.

[2] Luther did not object to the use of images, considering them as in themselves indifferent. Thus the Crucifix was retained by his followers, and is regularly used in Lutheran worship at the present day.

Tetrapolitan Confession, XXII.:

"Et in statuas denique atque imagines, nostri sacras orationes strinxerunt, eo potissimum, quod aperte coli et adorari coeperunt, inanesque sumptus in eas fieri, qui esurienti et sitienti, et nudo Christo debebantur, quod denique et cultu illarum sumptuque, quamlibet cum verbo Dei pugnante, merita apud Deum quaerunt. . . . Per se quidem liberum esse usum imaginum et nostri fatentur, sed quantumvis liber sit, Christiano spectandum est quid expediat, quid aedificet, et eo loci, eaque ratione imaginibus uti, ut nemini objiciat offendiculum."

Saxon Confession, Art. XXII.:

"Alii apud alias statuas existimantur esse magis propitii. Hi furores cum palam similes sint ethnicorum, et haud dubie valde irritent iram Dei, et a docentibus taxandi sunt, et a piis magistratibus severe puniendi."

Second Helvetic Confession, Art. IV.:

"Rejicimus itaque non modo Gentium idola, sed et Christianorum simulacra. Tametsi enim Christus humanam assumpserit naturam, non ideo tamen assumpsit, ut typum praeferret statuariis atque pictoribus. . . . Spiritu suo se nobis perpetuo affuturum promisit. Joan xvi., 2 Cor. v. Quis ergo crederet umbram vel simulacrum corporis aliquam conferre piis utilitatem? . . . Ut vero instituantur homines in religione, admoneanturque rerum divinarum et salutis suae, praedicare jussit Evangelium Dominus, Marc xvi., non pingere et pictura laicos erudire."

(4.) The Worshipping and Adoration of Relics.

We cannot wonder that our Church in the present Article strongly condemns the worship of relics, when we recall the disgusting spectacles of degrading superstition and of insatiable avarice afforded by the numerous pilgrimages to noted shrines in the times immediately preceding the Reformation. The ridiculous impostures to which the demand for relics gave rise are alluded to in some of the formularies and writings of the period. See, *e.g.*, Schmalkald Articles (p. 310):—

"Reliquiae sanctorum refertae multis mendaciis, ineptiis et fatuitatibus. Canum et equorum ossa ibi saepe reperta sunt. Et licet aliquid forte laudandum fuisset, tamen propter imposturas istas, quae diabolo risum excitarunt, jam dudum damnari debuissent, cum praesertim careant verbo Dei, et non necessariae et inutiles sint."

Cf. Homily against Peril of Idolatry (Third Part):—

"And, because relics were so gainful, few places were there but they had reliques provided for them. And, for more plenty

of reliques, some one Saint had many heads, one in one place, and another in another place. Some had six arms and twenty-six fingers. And, where our Lord bare His cross alone, if all the pieces of the reliques thereof were gathered together, the greatest ship in England would scarcely bear them. . . . And not only the bones of the Saints, but everything appertaining to them was an holy relique. In some place they offer a sword, in some the scabbard, in some a shoe, in some a saddle that had been set upon some holy horse, in some the coals wherewith St. Laurence was roasted, in some place the tail of the ass which our Lord Jesus Christ sat on, to be kissed and offered to for a relique. For, rather than they would lack a relique, they would offer you a horse bone instead of a virgin's arm, or the tail of the ass, to be kissed and offered unto for reliques. O wicked, impudent, and most shameless men, the devisers of these things! O seely, foolish, and dastardly daws, and more beastly than the ass whose tail they kissed, that believe such things!"

The Council of Trent recognised the prevalence of serious abuses in connection with the practice of the veneration of relics;[1] while an attempt was made to remove these, the practice itself was commended (Session XXV.):—

"Sanctorum quoque martyrum et aliorum cum Christo viventium sancta corpora, quae viva membra fuerunt Christi, et templum Spiritus sancti, ab ipso ad aeternam vitam suscitanda et glorificanda, a fidelibus veneranda esse per quae multa beneficia a Deo hominibus praestantur; ita ut affirmantes, sanctorum reliquiis venerationem atque honorem non deberi, vel eas aliaque sacra monumenta a fidelibus inutiliter honorari, atque eorum opis impetrandae causa sanctorum memorias frustra frequentari, omnino damnandos esse, prout jam pridem eos damnavit, et nunc etiam damnat ecclesia."

We may hold much the same position with regard to relics as in relation to images. It is one thing carefully to treasure precious relics, quite another thing to worship them. The latter action is justly condemned by our Article, but the former is due to a beautiful instinct of natural piety, in accordance with which we cherish, in the home, relics of loved friends departed, and, as a nation, carefully preserve in museums and public buildings relics and mementoes of national heroes and public benefactors. Such relics, whether of our own personal friends or of great men

[1] See p. 154, note 1.

of history, may often arouse within us lofty and noble thoughts, leading to high purposes and great resolves. In a similar manner, the contemplation of relics of the Saints of the Church may be most helpful to us who strive to follow in their train. From the time of the earliest persecutions relics of martyrs have been held in great respect by Christians. It was the general custom for the faithful to meet at the tombs of the martyrs, as in the Catacombs at Rome, for worship; and it was this, doubtless, which led to the practice in later times, when churches were built in other lands, of preserving within the altar a relic of some saint or martyr, in imitation of those first tombs of the martyred saints. From the period that the Empress Helena discovered the true Cross, relics occupied a very prominent position in the thoughts and affections of Christendom. An excellent statement of the true Christian position is afforded by the declaration of the Church at Smyrna after the martyrdom of Polycarp, when the Jews desired that his body should be entirely consumed lest the Christians should worship his relics:—

Ὑπέβαλον γοῦν τινὲς Νικήτην τὸν τοῦ Ἡρώδου πατέρα, ἀδελφὸν δὲ Ἄλκης, ἐντυχεῖν τῷ ἡγεμόνι, ὥστε μὴ δοῦναι αὐτοῦ τὸ σῶμα, 'μὴ,' φησὶν, 'ἀφέντες τὸν ἐσταυρωμένον, τοῦτον ἄρξωνται σέβειν.' Καὶ ταῦτα εἶπον, ὑποβαλόντων καὶ ἐνισχυσάντων Ἰουδαίων, οἳ καὶ ἐτήρησαν μελλόντων ἡμῶν ἐκ τοῦ πυρὸς αὐτὸν λαμβανεῖν, ἀγνοοῦντες ὅτι οὔτε τὸν Χριστόν ποτε καταλιπεῖν δυνησόμεθα, τὸν ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ παντὸς κόσμου τῶν σωζομένων σωτηρίας παθόντα, οὔτε ἕτερόν τινα σέβειν. Τοῦτον μὲν γὰρ, υἱὸν ὄντα τοῦ θεοῦ, προσκυνοῦμεν· τοὺς δὲ μάρτυρας, ὡς μαθητὰς καὶ μιμητὰς τοῦ Κυρίου, ἀγαπῶμεν ἀξίως, ἕνεκα εὐνοίας ἀνυπερβλήτου τῆς εἰς τὸν ἴδιον Βασιλέα καὶ Διδάσκαλον. ὧν γένοιτο καὶ ἡμᾶς συγκοινωνούς τε καὶ συμμαθητὰς γενέσθαι. Ἰδὼν οὖν ὁ ἑκατοντάρχης τὴν τῶν Ἰουδαίων γενομένην φιλονεικίαν, θεὶς αὐτὸν ἐν μέσῳ, ὡς ἔθος αὐτοῖς ἔκαυσεν. Οὕτως τε ἡμεῖς ὕστερον ἀνελόμενοι τὰ τιμιώτερα λίθων πολυτελῶν καὶ δοκιμώτερα ὑπὲρ χρυσίον ὀστᾶ αὐτοῦ, ἀπεθέμεθα ὅπου καὶ ἀκόλουθον ἦν. Ἔνθα ὡς δυνατὸν ἡμῖν συναγομένοις ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει καὶ χαρᾷ παρέξει ὁ Κύριος ἐπιτελεῖν τὴν τοῦ μαρτυρίου αὐτοῦ ἡμέραν γενέθλιον, εἴς τε τὴν τῶν προηθληκότων μνήμην, καὶ τῶν μελλόντων ἄσκησίν τε καὶ ἑτοιμασίαν.[1]

[1] Eusebius, "Hist. Eccles," IV. Cap. xv.

The Reformers of the Swiss School were not merely against the veneration of relics of the saints, but were opposed to preservation of such relics at all. See, *e.g.*—

Second Helvetic Confession, Art. V.:

> "Multo vero minus credimus reliquias divorum adorandas esse aut colendas. Veteres isti sancti satis honorasse videbantur mortuos suos, si honeste mandassent terrae reliquias, postquam astra petiisset spiritus; ac omnium nobilissimas reliquias majorum aestimabant esse virtutes, doctrinam et fidem, quas ut commendabant cum laude mortuorum, ita eas exprimere annitebantur, dum vivebant in terris."

(5.) Invocation of Saints.

Finally, our Article condemns the corrupt practice of the Latin Church in the times preceding the Reformation, when Invocation of Saints was carried on in such a way that only too often the common people worshipped the creature instead of the Creator.[1] Theoretically, of course, a distinction was kept between prayers addressed to God Himself as the Author and Giver of all good, and invocations of the saints, asking for their intercessions, in the name of Christ, on behalf of the suppliant. Thus, in theory, the prerogative of God as the one only independent Author of good, and the sole Mediatorship of Christ, was guarded. It is obvious, however, that in practice these two great truths might, with unlearned people, easily be obscured, as in fact they were, and that to such an extent that it is scarcely too much to say that by the sixteenth century invocation of the saints had taken the form of a grotesque polytheism. Thus Erasmus writes[2] concerning the prevailing custom of the day:—

> "Some worship divers gods with divers ceremonies. This man every day salutes Christopher and visits his image, with what object? Because he persuades himself that if he does so he will that day be safe from an evil death. Another adores a certain Rochus. Why? Because he believes he will drive away the plague. Another mutters prayers to Barbara or George, that he

---

[1] *Cf.* Saxon Confession, Art. XXII.:

> "Maria Mater gratiae, Tu nos ab hoste protege, In hora mortis suscipe." Hos versiculos audivimus doctorem theologiae monachum praefari morienti, et saepe repetere, cum quidem nullam Christi mentionem faceret, et possent exempla multa recitari.

[2] In the "Encomium Moriae."

may not fall into the hands of the enemy. This man fasts to Apollonia, that he may escape the toothache. Another visits the image of S. Job, that he may avoid the itch. In fact, as many things as there are that we either fear or wish for, so many gods have we made for them."

The decree of the COUNCIL OF TRENT on this subject (Session XXV.) runs as follows:—

"Mandat sancta Synodus omnibus episcopis . . . ut . . . fideles diligenter instruant, docentes eos, Sanctos una cum Christo regnantes, orationes suas pro hominibus Deo offerre, bonum atque utile esse suppliciter eos invocare; et ob beneficia impetranda a Deo per Filium ejus Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum, qui solus noster Redemptor et Salvator est, ad eorum orationes opem auxiliumque confugere: illos vero qui negant Sanctos, aeterna felicitate in coelo fruentes, invocandos esse: aut qui asserunt, vel illos pro hominibus non orare, vel eorum, ut pro nobis etiam singulis orent, invocationem esse idololatriam, vel pugnare cum verbo Dei, adversarique honori unius mediatoris Dei et hominum Jesu Christi, vel stultum esse in coelo regnantibus voce vel mente supplicare, impie sentire."

As in the case of its decrees on Purgatory and on the use of Images, the Council worded its declaration on the Invocation of Saints cautiously. That the saints pray for us who are members of the Church Militant is not, of course, to be denied,[1] but the practice of invoking them is justly censured by our Article, especially in view of the serious evils which are seen to result from the custom. It will be noticed that the Tridentine decree affirms that Invocation of Saints is not repugnant to the Word of God, and in no way interferes with the Mediatorial office of Christ, Who is the only Mediator between God and man. Whatever may be said or thought about the theory, such affirmation could scarcely be made with respect to the popular practice either of the pre-Reformation Church, or of the Church of Rome at the present day, for in Roman Catholic devotions which have authoritative sanction, more supplications are sometimes addressed to deceased human beings than to God the Father or to Christ; the Mediation of Christ is altogether out of sight, and the saints are addressed as though they were themselves independent dispensers of the blessings prayed for.

[1] See what has been said above under the head of Purgatory, p. 149.

A few examples are here given:—
(*a*) From the "Raccolta":[1]

"We fly beneath thy shelter, O holy Mother of God; despise not our petitions in our necessities, and deliver us always from all perils, O glorious and blessed Virgin."

. . . . . .

"Leave me not, my Mother, in my own hands, or I am lost. Let me but cling to thee. Save me, my Hope; save me from hell."

. . . . . .

"Michael, glorious prince, chief and champion of the heavenly host, . . . vouchsafe to free us all from every evil, who with full confidence have recourse to thee."

. . . . . .

"Benign Joseph, our Guide, protect us and the holy Church."

(*b*) The following passages from Liguori's "Glories of Mary"[2] may be compared in this connection:—

"Often we shall be heard more quickly, and be thus preserved, if we have recourse to Mary and call upon her name, than we should be if we called on the Name of Jesus our Saviour."

. . . . . .

"Many things are asked from God, and are not granted; they are asked from Mary, and are obtained."

. . . . . .

"At the command of the Virgin all things obey, even God."

. . . . . .

"Mary has only to speak and her Son executes all."

With such utterances as those above quoted we may contrast these passages of Scripture, S. Matt. xi. 28; S. John xiv. 6, 14; Acts iv. 12; 1 Tim. ii. 5, 6; Heb. vii. 25. We recall, moreover, how that angels are recorded in the New Testament to have promptly refused and forbidden acts of reverence done to themselves; see Rev. xix. 10, xxii. 8, 9.

[1] The prayers which this contains have Papal sanction, being specially "indulgenced." The passages given are from the English translation (Burns & Oates, 1873).

[2] Alfonzo Maria de Liguori was born at Naples in 1696, and died 1787. The "Congregation of Rites" declared in 1803 that "in all the writings of Alfonzo de Liguori there is not one word that can be justly found fault with;" and in 1839 he was solemnly canonised.

Reformers on the Continent, both of the Saxon and Swiss schools, were emphatic in their repudiation of the practice of Invocation of Saints, as the formularies of the period testify :—

Tetrapolitan Confession, Cap. XI. :

"Rejectus est et alius circa haec abusus, quod quidam precibus et jejuniis, Deiparam quoque virginem Mariam, aliosque divos sic demereri volunt, ut per eorum intercessionem et merita, cum animae, tum corporis malis liberentur, bonisque omne genus cumulentur."

Augsburg Confession, Part I. Art. XXI. :

"Sed Scriptura non docet invocare Sanctos, seu petere auxilium a Sanctis. Quia unum Christum nobis proponit mediatorem, propitiatorium, pontificem, et intercessorem."

Saxon Confession, Art. XXII. :

"Hoc loco reprehendimus hanc corruptelam ethnicam, quod defenditur consuetudo alloquentium homines, qui ex hac vita discesserunt, et petitur ab eis vel auxilium vel intercessio. . . .

Hanc doctrinam de Mediatore obscuratam et corruptam esse, manifestum est, cum confugerent homines ad matrem Virginem, tanquam magis propitiam, et alii alios mediatores quaererent."

Wurtemburg Confession, Art. XXIII. :

"Fatemur etiam quod sancti in coelis, suo quodam modo, pro nobis coram Deo orent, sicut et Angeli pro nobis sunt solliciti; et omnes creaturae pro salute nostra coelesti quodam modo ingemiscunt, et nobiscum, quemadmodum Paulus loquitur, parturiunt. Sed sicut ex gemitu reliquarum creaturarum non est instituendus cultus invocandi eas, ita ex oratione sanctorum in coelis non est approbandus cultus invocandi sanctos: de his enim invocandis nullum extat in sacris literis vel mandatum, vel exemplum."

French Confession, Art. XXIV. :

"Quicquid homines de mortuorum sanctorum intercessione commenti sunt, nihil aliud esse quam fraudem et fallacias Satanae, ut homines a recta precandi forma abduceret."

Belgic Confession, Art. XXVI. :

"Sola igitur diffidentia morem hunc induxit, quo sanctos (quos colere putamus) dedecore potius afficimus, dum ea patramus, quae tantum abest ut illi unquam viventes fecerint, ut potius ea constanter, et pro officio suo, rejecerint, sicuti scripta eorum testantur."

Second Helvetic Confession, Art. V. :

"Proinde sanctos coelites sive divos, nec adoramus, neque

colimus, nec invocamus, neque illos coram Patre in coelis pro intercessoribus aut mediatoribus nostris agnoscimus."

Art. XXIII.: "Divos coelites invocare, aut his uti pro intercessoribus, prohibet sacerdotium Christi Domini et vera religio."

A comparison of the above extracts shows us that, while the Lutheran school rejected the practice of Invocation of Saints, the formularies which give expression to the Helvetic and Calvinistic theology go further, and deny that the saints pray for us.

ARTICLE XXIII

OF MINISTERING IN THE CONGREGATION.

It is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of public preaching, or ministering the Sacraments in the Congregation,[1] before he be lawfully called and sent to execute the same. And those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work by men who have public authority given unto them in the Congregation, to call and send Ministers into the Lord's vineyard.

DE MINISTRANDO IN ECCLESIA.

Non licet cuiquam sumere sibi munus publice praedicandi, aut administrandi Sacramenta in Ecclesia, nisi prius fuerit ad haec obeunda legitime vocatus et missus. Atque illos legitime vocatos et missos existimare debemus, qui per homines, quibus potestas vocandi ministros atque mittendi in vineam Domini publice concessa est in Ecclesia, co-optati fuerint et adsciti in hoc opus.

§ 1.—*SOURCE.*

Composed by the English Reformers, 1552–3.

We may compare the AUGSBURG CONFESSION, Part I. Art. XIV.:—

> "De ordine ecclesiastico docent, quod nemo debeat in ecclesia publice docere, aut sacramenta administrare, nisi rite vocatus."

The language of this Article of the Augsburg Confession was adopted in the tenth of the XIII. ARTICLES of 1538:—

> "De ministris Ecclesiae docemus, quod nemo debeat publice docere, aut sacramenta ministrare nisi rite vocatus, et quidem ab his, penes quos in Ecclesia, juxta verbum Dei, et leges ac consuetudines uniuscujusque regionis, jus est vocandi et admittendi."

---

[1] The word 'Congregation' is evidently used here in the same sense as in Article XIX. (where see notes). It should be remarked that the Latin version has 'Ecclesia'; *cf.* Deut. xxiii. 1, 2, where the Vulgate gives 'Ecclesia' as the equivalent of קָהָל, the word denoting the whole assembly of Israel as the people of God. Ἐκκλησία is thus used in the New Testament in Acts vii. 38, Heb. xii. 23. We may illustrate from the wording of CANON 55:—

> "Christ's Holy Catholic Church; *i.e.*, the whole congregation of Christian people dispersed throughout the whole world."

§ 2.—*OBJECT.*

The Article is evidently directed against the error of those who maintained that any one believing himself called to the work of the Ministry was bound to exercise the functions of a Minister in defiance of all Church Authority.

§ 3.—*EXPOSITION.*

(1.) The Distinction between Clergy and Laity.

It is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of public preaching, or ministering the Sacraments in the Congregation.

That men may enjoy the blessings of the Gospel it must first be preached to them. Preachers, therefore, must be sent (Rom. x. 15). Thus Christ sent forth His Apostles (S. John xx. 21); and the Mission was handed on by them to others, so that the setting apart of certain members with authority to preach the Word publicly, and to be her ministers in sacred ordinances, dates from the very beginning of the Church's existence (Acts xiii. 1–3, xiv. 23; Eph. iv. 11, 12; Phil. i. 1). Such ministers of the Church are spoken of in the New Testament as "ambassadors of Christ" (2 Cor. v. 20), "ministers of Christ" (1 Cor. iv. 1), or "of God" (2 Cor. vi. 4), and "stewards of the mysteries of God" (1 Cor. iv. 1: *cf.* Col. i. 25; Tit. i. 7); they cannot of themselves assume authority as such, but must be called to the office by God Himself (Acts xx.28; Heb. v. 4).

(2.) The Need of Ordination for the Clergy.

It is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of public preaching, or ministering the Sacraments in the Congregation, before he be lawfully called and sent to execute the same.

We find in the New Testament:—

(*a*) That election by the people did not constitute a man a minister. See, *e.g.*, Acts vi. 5, 6, where, after the Seven Deacons had been chosen by the whole body of the brethren, we read that they were admitted to their office by the imposition of the Apostles' hands.

(*b*) Neither did the express inward call of the Holy Spirit itself alone suffice. See Acts xiii. 2, 3, where we have the account of the Ordination of SS. Barnabas and Paul by imposition of hands in obedience to a Divine command,

although they had already received the call of the Holy Spirit.

(*c*) We gather, therefore, that, from the very foundation of the Church, *Ordination* has been considered *necessary*. See the passages above quoted, and notice especially how, when the Apostles themselves were passing away from the earth, provision was made for the permanence of a duly ordained ministry[1] (1 Tim. iii., iv. 14, v. 22; 2 Tim. i. 6, ii. 2; Tit. i. 5).[2] Thus the Threefold Ministry has come down to us by succession from the Apostles.

Cf. the Preface to the ORDINAL:—

> "It is evident unto all men diligently reading the Holy Scripture and ancient Authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church: Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. Which Offices were evermore had in such reverend Estimation, that no man might presume to execute any of them, except he were first called, tried, examined, and known to have such qualities as are requisite for the same; and also by publick Prayer, with Imposition of Hands, were approved and admitted thereunto by lawful Authority."

---

[1] Several passages in the Epistle of S. Clement of Rome to the Corinthians (written 92–96 A.D.) are important in this connection:—

> "Κατὰ χώρας οὖν καὶ πόλεις κηρύσσοντες (scil. οἱ ἀπόστολοι) καθίστανον τὰς ἀπαρχὰς αὐτῶν, δοκιμάσαντες τῷ πνεύματι, εἰς ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους τῶν μελλόντων πιστεύειν" (xlii. 4).
>
> "Καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἡμῶν ἔγνωσαν διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ὅτι ἔρις ἔσται ἐπὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς. Διὰ ταύτην οὖν τὴν αἰτίαν πρόγνωσιν εἰληφότες τελείαν κατέστησαν τοὺς προειρημένους καὶ μεταξὺ ἐπινομὴν ἔδωκαν, ὅπως, ἐὰν κοιμηθῶσιν, διαδέξωνται ἕτεροι δεδοκιμασμένοι ἄνδρες τὴν λειτουργίαν αὐτῶν. Τοὺς οὖν κατασταθέντας ὑπ' ἐκείνων (scil. ἀποστολῶν) ἢ μεταξὺ ὑφ' ἑτέρων ἐλλογίμων ἀνδρῶν, συνευδοκησάσης τῆς ἐκκλησίας πασῆς, καὶ λειτουργήσαντας ἀμέμπτως τῷ ποιμνίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ μετὰ ταπεινοφροσύνης, ἡσύχως, καὶ ἀβαναύσως, μεμαρτυρημένους τε πολλοῖς χρόνοις ὑπὸ πάντων, τούτους οὐ δικαίως νομίζομεν ἀποβάλλεσθαι τῆς λειτουργίας" (xliv. 1–3).

[2] In the Pastoral Epistles we may trace the development of the Threefold Ministry. Two grades of ministers of the Church are mentioned—

(i.) διακόνοι (1 Tim. iii. 8);

(ii.) πρεσβύτεροι, or ἐπισκόποι (1 Tim. iii. 1); both these names being indifferently used for holders of one and the same office. *Cf.* Tit. i. 5–7; Acts xx. 17, 28.

Then (iii.) above these two orders we have the office held by Timothy and Titus at Ephesus and Crete respectively, with powers delegated by the Apostle S. Paul to ordain ministers (1 Tim. v. 22; Tit. i. 5), to take measures for ensuring the teaching of sound doctrine (1 Tim. i. 3, iv. 6, 13, 14; 2 Tim. i. 13, ii. 2, iv. 2–4; Tit. i. 9, 13, ii. 1, 2, 15), to administer discipline (1 Tim. iii. 10, v.; Tit. iii. 10), and to provide for the due order of the Church (1 Tim. iii. 15; Tit. i. 5). No official title is given to Timothy and Titus; but to this third and highest order the name ἐπισκόπος was afterwards transferred.

(3.) Whom are we to consider Lawfully Ordained?

Those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work by men who have public authority given unto them in the Congregation, to call and send Ministers into the Lord's vineyard.

The former part of the Article lays it down that Ministers must not be self-appointed; in this last clause it is declared that they must be appointed by those who have authority in the Church for this purpose; those are to be considered as lawfully ordained who are chosen and called by men who have public authority. It will be noticed that in the Latin text the words "**co-optati et adsciti**" correspond to the English "**chosen and called**"; both Latin words imply that Ministers must be admitted to their office by those who are themselves Ministers.

"**By men who have public authority given unto them**[1] **in the Congregation**"; i.e., *by the Bishops*. Episcopal Ordination is the necessary qualification in order to the exercising of Ministerial functions in the Church of England.

See the Preface to the Ordinal:—

> "And therefore, to the intent that these Orders may be continued, and reverently used and esteemed, in the [United] Church of England [and Ireland]; no man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon in the [United] Church of England [and Ireland], or suffered to execute any of the said Functions, except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted thereunto, according to the Form hereafter following, or hath had formerly Episcopal Consecration, or Ordination."

We see in the adoption of the Episcopal form of Government by the Church Universal from the earliest times the guiding

[1] The wording of the Article is somewhat vague here. We shall not be surprised at this if we recollect that the text still stands exactly as composed in 1552, when it was based upon, or drawn up with reference to, a previous Article which was the outcome of conferences between English and Lutheran divines (see § 1 above). The English Church itself has always held fast to the Episcopal government of the Church, and insisted on the necessity of Episcopal Ordination, in this respect retaining its organic unity with the pre-Reformation Church, and parting company with foreign Reformers, both Lutheran and Swiss. Certain individual bishops, who sympathised rather with the polity of Continental Reformed bodies than with the Order of the English Church, may have been guilty of irregularities (*e.g.*, Archbishop Grindal, in Queen Elizabeth's reign, licensed a certain John Morrison to officiate in England, who had only received Presbyterian orders in Scotland), but still the *Rule of the Church in this country has always been the same.*

hand of the Holy Spirit. The first serious departure from it was owing to the action of certain so-called Reformers in some countries (*e.g.*, in Germany, Geneva, and Scotland) in the sixteenth century.[1] Since that time we have had ample proof that Gospel Truth and the Divinely-appointed Constitution of the Church stand or fall together; where the latter is departed from the first is soon tampered with, or imperfectly held.

[1] It was not the wish of the earlier generation of Lutheran Reformers to abandon the historic constitution of the Church. *Cf.* Melancthon, Apol. Augsburg Conf., VII. xiv. 23, 24:—

> "Hac de re in hoc conventu (viz.: at Augsburg) saepe testati sumus, nos summa voluntate cupere conservare politiam ecclesiasticam, et gradus in ecclesia factos etiam humana auctoritate. . . . Porro hic iterum volumus testatum, nos libenter conservaturos esse ecclesiasticam et canonicam politiam, si modo episcopi desinant in nostras ecclesias saevire."

Owing to the hostility of the bishops the Lutheran Reformers were unable to secure the episcopal succession, and we find accordingly that episcopacy was gradually abandoned in those States which had espoused the cause of the Reformation. It was suppressed in Hesse in 1526, and in Denmark in 1536, but lingered in Prussia until 1587; while in Sweden, where the Reformation was carried out on Lutheran lines, the old episcopal arrangements were continued and remain to the present day.

In Switzerland, Zwingli, whose tendencies were at once Erastian and republican, abandoned episcopacy from the first, framing his ecclesiastical polity upon the republican model of the civil government. Calvin, on the other hand, not only expressed a willingness to recognise the authority of the bishops (when exercised without tyranny), but even declared that those who refuse obedience to such authority are worthy of anathema:—

> "Itaque quicquid jubent (scil. episcopi) ac praescribunt, id necessario observandum esse contendunt a populo Christiano: qui violaverit, eum duplicis inobedientiae reum esse, quod Deo et ecclesiae sit rebellis. Sane si veri episcopi essent, aliquid eis in hac parte auctoritatis tribuerem, non quantum sibi postulant, sed quantum ad politiam ecclesiae rite ordinandam requiritur" (INSTITUTES, IV. x. 6).
>
> "Talem nobis hierarchiam si exhibeant in qua sic emineant episcopi, ut Christo subesse non recusent, ut ab illo tanquam ab unico capite pendeant et ad ipsum referantur . . . tum vero nullo non anathemate dignos fatear, si qui erunt, qui non eam reverentur, summaque obedientia observant" (De Necessitate Reform. Eccles.).

ARTICLE XXIV

OF SPEAKING IN THE CONGREGATION IN SUCH A TONGUE AS THE PEOPLE UNDERSTANDETH.

It is a thing plainly repugnant to the Word of God, and the custom of the Primitive Church, to have Publick Prayer in the Church, or to minister the Sacraments, in a tongue not understanded of the people.

DE PRECIBUS PUBLICIS DICENDIS IN LINGUA VULGARI.

Lingua populo non intellecta publicas in Ecclesia preces peragere, aut Sacramenta administrare, Verbo Dei et Primitivae Ecclesiae consuetudini plane repugnat.

§ 1.—*SOURCE.*

Composed by the English Reformers.

§ 2.—*OBJECT.*

To reform the usage of the Church in the matter of the language used in Public Worship. The explanation of the use of Latin in the Western Church is to be found in the fact that at one time that language was understood all over Western Christendom. It was only by slow degrees that Latin ceased to be a living language, but in the lapse of centuries it gradually came about that the Church services, the language of which was stereotyped, were said in a tongue of which the bulk of the people understood less and less. So very gradual, however, was the decay of the language, that no definite time occurred for changing the language of the service-books until the Reformation. In 1553 the Article on this subject ran as follows:—

MENNE MUST SPEAKE IN THE CONGREGATION IN SOCHE TOUNG AS THE PEOPLE VNDERSTANDETH.

It is moste semelie, and moste agreable to the Woorde of God that in the congregation nothing be openlie readde, or spoken in a tongue vnknowen to the people, the whiche thinge S. Paule didde forbidde except some were presente that should declare the same.

AGENDUM EST IN ECCLESIA LINGUA QUAE SIT POPULO NOTA.

Decentissimum est et Verbo Dei maxime congruit, ut nihil in Ecclesia publice legatur aut recitetur lingua populo ignota, idque Paulus fieri vetuit, nisi adesset qui interpretaretur.

The Council of Trent (Session XXII., September 1562) decreed:—

> "Etsi missa magnam contineat populi fidelis eruditionem, non tamen expedire visum est patribus, ut vulgari passim lingua celebraretur."

Cf. Canon IX. of the same Session:—

> "Si quis dixerit . . . lingua tantum vulgari Missam celebrari debere . . . anathema sit."

The fact that the Church of Rome was holding fast to the use of the Latin language in the public services of the Church, doubtless accounts for the stronger form in which our Article was recast in 1563.

§ 3.—*EXPOSITION.*

The Article simply affirms that **to have Publick Prayer in the Church, or to minister the Sacraments, in a tongue not understanded of the people, is a thing plainly repugnant to**—

(1.) **the Word of God.** See especially 1 Cor. xiv. 11–19.

The general rule laid down in Holy Scripture is, "Let all things be done unto edifying" (1 Cor. xiv. 26).

(2.) **the custom of the Primitive Church.**

It is quite certain that, in the earliest times, Christians in every land offered common Prayer and celebrated the Holy Eucharist in the vernacular. Thus the Liturgies of the Greek-speaking Churches of the East were Greek, and the Liturgy of the Church of Rome itself (at first a Greek-speaking community) was also Greek in the very earliest days; we may see a survival of this in the "Kyrie Eleison" still repeated before the Lord's Prayer in the Mass.

It is to be noted that in this Article—

(1.) *The Church of England takes Holy Scripture as its Rule,* contrary to which nothing may be decreed (*cf.* Article XX.), and (2.) *takes the Primitive Church as its pattern.*

Throughout the Reformation period we find the authorities of the English Church constantly referring to the practice of the Primitive Church as their standard. In illustration of this we may quote the following passages:—

The Act of Uniformity, 1549.

> "Havinge eye and respecte to the most sincere and pure Christian Religion taught by the Scripture, as to the usages of the Primatyve Church."

The Commination, 1549:

"Brethren, in the primitive Church there was a godlye disciplyne . . . until the saide disciplyne may bee restored agayne; (which thynge is muche to bee wyshed)."

The Ordinal (Preface), 1549:

"From the Apostles' tyme there hathe bene these orders of Ministers in Christes Church."

The Act of Uniformity, 1552:

The Prayer Book of 1549 is spoken of as "a verye godly Order, agreeable to the Worde of God, and the Primative Church."

"Homily against Peril of Idolatry, 1562:

"The usage of the primitive Church, which was most pure and uncorrupt" (p. 180).

"And there is no doubt but the primitive Church next the Apostles' times was most pure" (p. 212).

"The primitive Church, which is specially to be followed as most incorrupt and pure" (p. 231).

The Canons, 1604:

"Forasmuch as the ancient Fathers of the Church, led by example of the Apostles, appointed prayers and fasts to be used at the solemn Ordering of Ministers; and to that purpose allotted certain times, in which only Sacred Orders might be given or conferred: we, following their holy and religious example, do constitute and decree . . . " (Canon XXXI.).

Extracts are here appended from some of the more important Continental Confessions, to show how Reformers of various schools dealt with the question of the language to be used in Public worship:—

Augsburg Confession, Part II. Art. III., "De Missa":

"Servantur et usitatae ceremoniae fere omnes, praeterquam quod Latinis cantionibus admiscentur alicubi Germanicae, quae additae sunt ad docendum populum. Nam ad hoc unum opus est ceremoniis, ut doceant imperitos. Et non modo Paulus praecipit uti lingua intellecta populo in ecclesia, sed etiam ita constitutum est humano jure."

Wurtemburg Confession, Art. XXVII.:

"Sicut enim conciones et precationes lingua Ecclesiae nota habendae sunt, ita et sacramenta noto sermone dispensanda sunt.

Etsi enim licebit aliquoties peregrina lingua propter studiosos uti, tamen consensus Catholicae Ecclesiae hoc exigit, ut necessaria ministeria Ecclesiae fiant sermone vernaculo."

Second Helvetic Confession, Art. XXII.:

"Taceant ergo omnes peregrinae linguae in coetibus sacris. Omnia proponantur lingua vulgari, et quae eo in loco ab hominibus in coetu intelligatur."

ARTICLE XXV

OF THE SACRAMENTS.

Sacraments ordained of Christ, be not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession: but rather they be certain sure witnesses, and effectual signs of grace, and God's good will towards us, by the which He doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in Him.

There are two Sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel, that is to say, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord.

Those five, commonly called Sacraments, that is to say, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction, are not to be counted for Sacraments of the Gospel, being such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the Apostles, partly are states of life allowed in the Scriptures: but yet have not like nature of Sacraments with Baptism and the Lord's Supper, for that they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God.

The Sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, or to be carried about: but that we should duly use them. And in such only as worthily receive the same, they have a wholesome effect or operation: but they that receive them unworthily, purchase to themselves damnation, as Saint Paul saith.

DE SACRAMENTIS.

Sacramenta a Christo instituta, non tantum sunt notae professionis Christianorum, sed certa quaedam potius testimonia, et efficacia signa gratiae atque bonae in nos voluntatis Dei, per quae invisibiliter ipse in nobis operatur, nostramque fidem in se, non solum excitat, verum etiam confirmat.

Duo a Christo Domino nostro in Evangelio instituta sunt Sacramenta, scilicet, Baptismus et Coena Domini.

Quinque illa vulgo nominata Sacramenta, scilicet, Confirmatio, Poenitentia, Ordo, Matrimonium, et Extrema Unctio, pro Sacramentis Evangelicis habenda non sunt, ut quae partim a prava Apostolorum imitatione profluxerunt, partim vitae status sunt in Scripturis quidem probati, sed Sacramentorum eandem cum Baptismo et Coena Domini rationem non habentes: ut quae signum aliquod visibile seu ceremoniam a Deo institutam non habeant.

Sacramenta non in hoc instituta sunt a Christo, ut spectarentur, aut circumferrentur, sed ut rite illis uteremur: Et in his duntaxat qui digne percipiunt, salutarem habent effectum: Qui vero indigne percipiunt, damnationem (ut inquit Paulus) sibi ipsis acquirunt.

§ 1. *SOURCE.*

The first clause of the Article is evidently taken from Article IX. of the XIII. ARTICLES of 1538:—

> "Docemus, quod Sacramenta quae per Verbum Dei instituta sunt, non tantum sint notae professionis inter Christianos, sed magis certa quaedam testimonia et efficacia signa gratiae, et bonae voluntatis Dei erga nos, per quae Deus invisibiliter operatur in nobis, et suam gratiam in nos invisibiliter diffundit, siquidem ea rite susceperimus; quodque per ea excitatur et confirmatur fides in his qui eis utuntur."

The wording of this passage of the XIII. Articles is in its turn traceable to the AUGSBURG CONFESSION, Part I. Art. XIII.:—

> "De usu sacramentorum docent, quod sacramenta instituta sint, non modo ut sint notae professionis inter homines, sed magis ut sint signa et testimonia voluntatis Dei erga nos, ad excitandam et confirmandam fidem in his qui utuntur proposita."

A careful comparison shows us that, while adopting the phraseology of the Augsburg Confession, the English divines made very significant additions to it.

In the XLII. ARTICLES of 1553 the Articles on the Sacraments ran thus:—

[Our Lorde Jesus Christe hathe knitte toguether a companie of newe people with Sacramentes, moste fewe in numbre, most easie to bee kepte, moste excellent in significatione, as is Baptisme, and the Lorde's Supper.]

The Sacramentes were not ordeined of Christe to be gased upon, or to be carried about, but that we should rightlie use them. And in soche onely as worthelie receiue the same, thei haue an wholesome effecte, and operacione, [and yet not that of the woorke wrought, as some men speake, whiche worde, as it is straunge, and vnknowen to holie Scripture; so it engendreth no godlie, but a verie supersticious sense.] But thei that receiue the Sacramentes vnwoorthelie purchace to theimselues damnatione, as Saincte Paule saieth.

[Dominus noster Jesus Christus Sacramentis numero paucissimis, observatu facillimis, significatione praestantissimis, societatem novi populi colligavit, sicuti est Baptismus et Coena Domini.]

Sacramenta non instituta sunt a Christo ut spectarentur aut circumferrentur, sed ut rite illis uteremur: Et in his duntaxat qui digne percipiunt, salutarem habent effectum, [idque non ex opere, ut quidam loquuntur, operato; quae vox, ut peregrina est et Sacris literis ignota, sic parit sensum minime pium sed admodum superstitiosum.] Qui vero indigne percipiunt, damnationem (ut inquit Paulus) sibi ipsis acquirunt.

Sacramentes ordeined by the worde of God be not onely badges, and tokens of Christien mennes professione, but rather thei bee certeine sure witnesses, and effectuall signes of grace, and Goddes good will towarde vs, by the whiche he dothe worke inuisiblie in vs, and dothe not onlie quicken, but also strengthen, and confirme our faith in him.

Sacramenta per Verbum Dei instituta, non tantum sunt notae professionis Christianorum, sed certa quaedam potius testimonia et efficacia signa gratiae atque bonae in nos voluntatis Dei, per quae invisibiliter ipse in nobis operatur, nostramque fidem in se non solum excitat, verum etiam confirmat.

This Article was entirely recast in 1563.

(1.) The opening paragraph[1] (enclosed in brackets above) was altogether omitted.

(2.) In 1553 the idea was condemned that the Sacraments have a wholesome effect, arising "*ex opere operato.*" This phrase had been understood, at the time, to mean, that the mere act of receiving, altogether apart from a right disposition in the recipient, confers the grace of the Sacrament. Such an opinion could not, of course, be too strongly condemned.[2]

The condemnation, however, in reality arose from a misunderstanding of the meaning of the expression. "*Ex opere operato*" was, in the scholastic terminology, opposed to "*ex opere operantis,*" and was meant to exclude all idea of human merit; it signified that Grace is given to man upon performance of the outward work, or action, to which God has attached the promise, and was

[1] This paragraph was taken almost verbatim from S. Augustine's Epistle to Januarius. The same words had been made use of by Alesius in the debate on the subject of the Sacraments in 1536.

[2] The theory that the Sacraments confer grace "*ex opere operato*" was also condemned in the following formularies:—

AUGSBURG CONFESSION, Part I. Art. XIII:

> "Damnant igitur illos, qui docent, quod sacramenta ex opere operato justificent, nec docent fidem requiri in usu sacramentorum, quae credat remitti peccata."

XIII. ARTICLES, Art. IX.:

> "Neque enim in illis verum est, quod quidam dicunt, sacramenta conferre gratiam ex opere operato, sine bono motu utentis, nam in ratione utentibus necessum est, ut fides etiam utentis accedat, per quam credat illis promissionibus, et accipiat res promissas, quae per sacramenta conferantur."

SAXON CONFESSION, Art. XV.:

> "Aperte damnamus portentosum errorem monachorum, qui scripserunt, sumptionem mereri remissionem peccatorum, et quidem ex opere operato, sine bono motu utentis. Haec pharisaica imaginatio pugnat cum dicto, Justus sua fide vivet."

not meant to imply that Grace is given for any merit in the performance of the action by man (this would be "*ex opere operantis*"). Thus the spiritual partaking of Christ, whereby we dwell in Him, and He in us, is not, ordinarily,[1] granted to us apart from the performance of the outward action (viz., the partaking of the consecrated Elements in the Eucharist), to which Christ Himself has attached the promise of the spiritual blessing. This efficacy of the Sacrament is not, of course, owing to any virtue or merit in our action, but solely to the work performed by Divine agency through it.

The COUNCIL OF TRENT (Session VII.) affirmed the efficacy of the Sacraments "*ex opere operato.*"

See CANON VIII.:—

> "Si quis dixerit, per ipsa novae legis Sacramenta ex opere operato non conferri gratiam, sed solam fidem divinae promissionis ad gratiam consequendam sufficere; anathema sit."

At the same time the Council so worded its declarations as to guard the meaning of the expression.

Cf. CANON VI. (of the same Session):—

> "Si quis dixerit, Sacramenta novae legis non continere gratiam, quam significant, aut gratiam ipsam non ponentibus obicem non conferre . . . anathema sit."

When the phrase "*ex opere operato*" had been cleared from the objectionable sense which had become attached to it the Reformers could no longer object to it, and the clause in this Article (enclosed in brackets above) which condemned it was, therefore, removed in 1563.

[1] We must insert this qualifying word, because we doubt not that God gives the spiritual grace apart from the performance of the action commanded, when the performance of such action has been rendered impossible by adverse circumstances. We are bound to use the Sacraments wherever they may be had, but God in His operation is not tied to them.

Cf. the Rubric in the Order for "the Communion of the Sick":—

> "But if a man, either by reason of extremity of sickness, or for want of warning in due time to the Curate, or for lack of company to receive with him, or by any other just impediment, do not receive the Sacrament of Christ's Body and Blood, the Curate shall instruct him, that if he do truly repent him of his sins, and stedfastly believe that Jesus Christ hath suffered death upon the Cross for him, and shed his Blood for his redemption, earnestly remembering the benefits he hath thereby, and giving him hearty thanks therefore, he doth eat and drink the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ profitably to his soul's health, although he do not receive the Sacrament with his mouth."

(3.) The concluding paragraph was transposed and made the first paragraph of the new Article.

(4.) The middle portion of the Article as it now stands was composed and inserted.

One small change has been since made in the wording of this section. As originally drawn up in 1563, besides the statement that the "five commonly called Sacraments . . . are not to be counted for Sacraments of the Gospel," it also contained a very express declaration that "Penance" [1] hath not the like nature of a Sacrament with Baptism and the Lord's Supper :—

"But yet have not like nature of Sacraments with Baptism and the Lord's Supper. In which sort neither is Penance, for that it hath not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God."	"Sed Sacramentorum eandem cum Baptismo et Coena Domini rationem non habentes: quomodo nec poenitentia, ut quae signum aliquod visibile seu ceremoniam a Deo institutam non habeant."

The words "quomodo nec poenitentia" and the corresponding words in the English text were omitted when the Articles were re-issued in 1571.

§ 2. *OBJECT.*

(1.) To condemn disparagement of the Sacraments by declaring that they are more than badges or tokens of our profession.

(2.) To distinguish Baptism and the Holy Eucharist from other ordinances "commonly called sacraments" by claiming for them the special title of "Sacraments of the Gospel."

(3.) To emphasise the necessity of a right disposition in the recipient.

§ 3. *EXPOSITION.*

THE NAME "SACRAMENT."

The Latin "sacramentum" was used in early times as a rendering of the Greek *μυστήριον*. It is thus used, *e.g.*, in the Vulgate version of Eph. i. 9, iii. 3, v. 32; Col. i. 27; 1 Tim. iii. 16; Rev. i. 20.

Our word "Sacrament" therefore simply represents the Greek

[1] This special reference to "Penance" in the Article of 1563 was probably due to the fact that some had been inclined to class that ordinance as a third "Sacrament of the Gospel." The X. ARTICLES (1536) had treated of three Sacraments—(1) "The Sacrament of Baptism;" (2) "The Sacrament of Penance;" (3) "The Sacrament of the Altar." The Lutheran Reformers also gave an honourable place in their system to Confession and Absolution. Melanchthon, in the "Apology" for the Augsburg Confession, writes (p. 167) :—

"Absolutio proprie dici potest sacramentum poenitentiae."

name "Mystery," which has been applied to the sacred ordinances of the Church from primitive times,[1] and which is still the usual name of the Sacraments in the Eastern Church at the present day. Other derivations of the name have been proposed; *e.g.*, it is sometimes stated that the ordinances of the Church obtained the name of "Sacraments" owing to the resemblance of the initiatory rite of Baptism, wherein the Christian pledges his fidelity to Christ, to the ceremony attending the Roman soldier's taking the oath of loyalty (*sacramentum*) to his commander. However suggestive this comparison may be, it does not appear to be the true account of the origin of the term "Sacrament" as applied to the ordinances of the Church.

The word "Sacrament," meaning "Mystery," is capable of a very wide signification.

Cf. the HOMILY OF COMMON PRAYER AND SACRAMENTS (p. 377):—

> "In a general acceptation the name of a Sacrament may be attributed to anything whereby an holy thing is signified."

But the word is commonly used by the Church in a more restricted sense to denote—

> "Visible signs expressly commanded in the New Testament, whereunto is annexed the promise of free forgiveness of our sin and of our holiness and joining in Christ" (*Ibid.*, p. 376).

See also the explanation given in the CHURCH CATECHISM:—

> "*Question.* What meanest thou by this word *Sacrament?*
> "*Answer.* I mean an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us, ordained by Christ Himself, as a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof."

THE SACRAMENTAL PRINCIPLE.

(*a*) God always, by His very nature, wishes to declare Himself. From all eternity, even before the universe was made, He has done so, by the eternal generation of the Son, which

[1] *Cf.*, *e.g.*, the opening words of the first of the series of Lectures delivered (A.D. 386) by S. Cyril of Jerusalem on the Sacraments:—

> Ἐπόθουν ὑμῖν καὶ πάλαι, ὦ γνήσια καὶ περιπόθητα τῆς ἐκκλησίας τέκνα, περὶ τῶν πνευματικῶν τούτων καὶ ἐπουρανίων διαλεχθῆναι μυστηρίων.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> ἄλλως τε καὶ χωρητικοὶ τῶν θειοτέρων κατέστητε μυστηρίων, θειοῦ καὶ ζωοποιοῦ βαπτίσματος ἀξιωθέντες.

may thus be spoken of as a Sacrament. The Son, or Word, of God, is something outward to declare God Himself, Who is hidden (Col. i. 15).

(*b*) God declares Himself in Creation. The visible creation is Sacramental, being an outward sign of the invisible God (Rom. i. 20).

(*c*) God has declared Himself more particularly in the Incarnation. The human body of Jesus living amongst men was an outward and visible sign of the dwelling of God with men, and of His union with man (Col. ii. 9).

We see, therefore, that when God uses Sacraments in the Church, His action is most suited to His own nature. He acts upon that same principle in accordance with which He has always acted.

We now come to examine the statements of our Article in detail. It treats of—

(1.) The Nature of Sacraments.

(A.) *WHAT SACRAMENTS ARE NOT.*

Sacraments ordained of Christ be not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession.

Zwingli held that the grace of God is always given to the spirit of man immediately.

Cf. Fidei Ratio, § 7 :—

"Credo, imo scio omnia sacramenta tam abesse ut gratiam conferant, ut ne adferant quidem aut dispensent. Qua in re forsan audacior tibi videri potero, potentissime Caesar.[1] Sed stat sententia. Nam gratia ut a spiritu divino fit aut datur (loquor autem latine cum gratiae nomine utor, pro venia scilicet indulgentia et gratuito beneficio) ita donum istud ad solum spiritum pervenit. Dux autem vel vehiculum spiritui non est necessarium, ipse enim est virtus et latio qua cuncta feruntur, non qui ferri opus habeat; neque id unquam legimus in scripturis sacris, quod sensibilia, qualia sacramenta sunt, certo secum ferrent spiritum, sed si sensibilia unquam lata sunt cum spiritu, jam spiritus fuit qui tulit, non sensibilia."

According to this view Sacraments can never be means of grace. With regard to Baptism, therefore, Zwingli taught that it is merely the external badge of membership in the Christian community, or a sort of certificate of spiritual life, which, however, if imparted at all, was imparted independently of the material element.

[1] The treatise was addressed to the Emperor (Charles V.).

Fidei Ratio, § 7 :—

> "Baptismo igitur Ecclesia publice recipit eum, qui prius receptus est per gratiam. Non ergo adfert gratiam baptismus, sed gratiam factam esse ei cui datur, Ecclesiae testatur. Credo igitur, O Caesar, sacramentum esse sacrae rei, hoc est factae gratiae, signum. Credo esse invisibilis gratiae, quae scilicet Dei munere facta et data est, visibilem figuram sive formam, hoc est visibile exemplum, quod tamen fere analogiam quandam rei per spiritum gestae prae se fert. Credo testimonium publicum esse."

Cf. the same writer's words in his treatise "De Baptismo" :—

> "Baptismus foederis vel pacti signum est, non in hunc finem institutum, ut eum qui baptizari solet justum efficiat, vel fidem baptizati confirmet. Impossible enim est ut res aliqua externa fidem hominis internam confirmet et stabiliat" (Works, ii. 63).

The same principle is also laid down by Zwingli with regard to the Eucharist :—

> "Nihil ergo eorum, quae externa sunt, fidem firmare vel nos in illa certiores reddere potest. Quod idem simili ratione de Eucharistia quoque, vel Coena Domini pronunciamus" (Works, ii. 63).

This view of the Sacraments had spread widely on the Continent, and had also found its way into this country. It is expressly repudiated in our Article, as it was also by Luther, who denounced the opinion as "diabolical," and by Calvin, who characterised the teaching of the Zurich Reformer as "profana," [1] "falsa et perniciosa." [2] Even those of our English divines who went furthest in their agreement with the "Reformed" theology rejected the idea that the Sacraments are bare signs ; [3] *e.g.*, Hooper thus writes to Bucer (from Zurich, June 19, 1548) :—

> "You write word, reverend sir, that you cannot believe the sacraments to be bare signs. Far be such a belief from the most unlearned Christian ! . . . I do not write for the sake of dispute, but that I may testify to you, that the sacraments with us are not bare signs" (Original Letters, i. 47, 48).

---

[1] In a letter to Viret, 1542.

[2] In a letter to Zebedæus, 1539.

[3] Zwingli himself was not always consistent, for at the Conference at Marburg (1529) he signed the following statement :—

> "Baptismum esse sacramentum ad fidem a Deo institutum et praeceptum, non nudum signum, aut tesseram professionis Christianae, sed et opus Dei, in quo fides nostra requiritur, et per quam regeneramur."

Latimer expresses himself more strongly :—

> "In all ages the devil hath stirred up some light heads to esteem the Sacraments but lightly, as to be empty and bare signs" (Ridley's Works, p. 114).

Cf. also the following extracts from formularies :—

Augsburg Confession, Part I. Art. XIII. :

> "De usu Sacramentorum docent, quod sacramenta instituta sint, non modo ut sint notae professionis inter homines, sed magis ut sint signa et testimonia voluntatis Dei erga nos, ad excitandam et confirmandem fidem in his qui utuntur proposita."

Saxon Confession, Art. XIII. :

> "Quae tamen non sunt tantum signa professionis, sed multo magis (ut vetustas dixit) signa gratiae."

Scotch Confession, Art. XXI. :

> "Itaque vanitatem eorum, qui affirmant, Sacramenta nil aliud quam mera et nuda signa esse, omnino damnamus."

Belgic Confession, Art. XXXIII. :

> "Itaque signa illa minime vana sunt aut vacua."

In the Reformatio Legum the following statement is made on the subject ("De Haeresibus," Cap. 17) :—

> "Magna quoque temeritas illorum est, qui sacramenta sic extenuant ut ea pro nudis signis, et externis tantum indiciis capi velint, quibus tanquam notis hominum Christianorum religio possit a caeteris internosci."

(B.) *WHAT SACRAMENTS ARE.*[1]

(i.) **Sacraments ordained of Christ be not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession.**

The Church is a visible society, Baptism the initiatory rite admitting to Church membership, and the Holy Eucharist the pledge and security of union. The Sacraments may thus be looked upon as badges or tokens of our profession as Christians. *Cf.* 1 Cor. i. 13–17, where S. Paul's argu-

[1] With the wording of our Article we may compare Calvin's definition :—

> "Videtur autem mihi haec simplex et propria fore definitio, si dixerimus externum esse symbolum, quo benevolentiae erga nos suae promissiones conscientiis nostris Dominus obsignat, ad sustinendam fidei nostrae imbecillitatem; et nos vicissim pietatem erga eum nostram, tam coram eo et angelis, quam apud homines testamur. Licet etiam majore compendio aliter definire; ut vocetur divinae in nos gratiae testimonium, externo signo confirmatum, cum mutua nostrae erga ipsum pietatis testificatione" (Institutes, IV. xiv. 1).

ment seems to imply that Baptism was regarded as an acknowledgment on the part of a convert of allegiance to his new Master.

But Sacraments have a far higher significance than this—

(ii.) **Rather they be certain sure witnesses . . . of grace, and God's good will towards us.**

The Sacraments are pledges of the Divine Will in regard to man, and sureties of the truth of God's promises; they are "pledges to assure us" of "the inward and spiritual grace given unto us" (CHURCH CATECHISM).

When it is said that they are "**certain sure witnesses**," it is meant that they are such witnesses of God's grace and good will as we may feel confident will never deceive us.

(iii.) **Effectual signs**[1] **of grace, and God's good will towards us.**

In other words, a Sacrament actually effects that of which it is the sign. Baptism is a sign of Regeneration, and actually effects the same. Thus in the Baptismal Office, immediately after the act of Baptism, the Priest says, "Seeing now, dearly beloved brethren, that *this Child is regenerate*" (*cf.* Tit. iii. 5; 1 S. Pet. iii. 21).

Again, the Holy Eucharist is an outward sign of our Communion with Christ, and the partaking of it actually effects that Communion (1 Cor. x. 16). *Cf.* the words of the long Exhortation in the Communion Service:—

> "For as the benefit is great, if with a true penitent heart and lively faith we receive that holy Sacrament; (for then we spiritually eat the flesh of Christ, and drink His blood; then we dwell in Christ, and Christ in us; we are one with Christ, and Christ with us)." . . .

(iv.) **By the which He doth work invisibly in us.**

The words "**by the which**" refer to the Sacraments, as is clear in the Latin text (**per quae**). The Sacraments are thus the channels whereby the grace of God flows into the soul; they are the "means whereby we receive" the inward and spiritual grace (CHURCH CATECHISM).

We should note that God is declared to be the efficient

[1] We may illustrate the meaning of the expression from Cranmer's "Answer to Gardiner" (Works, vol. iii. p. 38):—

> "They be no vain nor bare tokens, as you would persuade (for a bare token is that which betokeneth only and giveth nothing, as a painted fire which giveth neither light nor heat); but in the due ministration of the Sacraments God is present, working with His Word and Sacraments."

Cause, Who confers grace by the Sacraments; the Sacraments themselves are not efficient, but instrumental, causes of grace. Canon VI. of Session VII. of the COUNCIL OF TRENT (quoted above, p. 176), speaks of the Sacraments as "conferring" grace.

With the wording of our Article *cf.* the BELGIC CONFESSION, Art. XXXIII.:—

> "Sunt enim Sacramenta signa, ac symbola visibilia rerum internarum et invisibilium, per quae ceu per media Deus ipse virtute Spiritus Sancti in nobis agit."

(v.) **And doth not only quicken (excitat), but also strengthen and confirm our faith in Him.**

This clause is directly opposed to the Zwinglian theory of the Sacraments; see the passages from Zwingli quoted above, p. 180.

(2.) THE NUMBER OF SACRAMENTS.

There are two Sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel, that is to say, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord.

Of Sacramental Ordinances our Church gives a place of special honour to those two, the institution of which by our Lord Himself is expressly recorded in the New Testament, viz.:—

(*a.*) Baptism (S. Matt. xxviii. 19), and

(*b.*) The Lord's Supper (1 Cor. xi. 23–26).

Cf. CHURCH CATECHISM:—

> "*Question.* How many Sacraments hath Christ ordained in His Church?
>
> "*Answer.* Two only, as generally necessary to salvation, that is to say, Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord."

The position of the English Church is well illustrated by the REFORMATIO LEGUM, "De Sacramentis," Cap. 2. Quid in Sacramento quaerendum sit:—

> "Ad Sacramenti perfectionem tria concurrere debent. Primum evidens est et illustris nota, quae manifeste cerni possit. Secundum est Dei promissum, quod externo signo nobis repraesentatur et plane confirmatur. Tertium est Dei praeceptum, quo necessitas nobis imponitur, ista partim faciendi, partim commemorandi; quae tria cum authoritate Scripturarum in Baptismo solum occurrant, et Eucharistia, nos haec duo sola pro veris et propriis novi testamenti sacramentis ponimus."

See also the HOMILY OF COMMON PRAYER AND SACRAMENTS (p. 376):—

> "And as for the number of them, if they should be considered according to the exact signification of a Sacrament, namely, for visible signs expressly commanded in the New Testament, whereunto is annexed the promise of free forgiveness of our sin and of our holiness and joining in Christ, there be but two, namely, Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord."

The express limitation of the term "Sacrament," as a definite title, to seven ordinances of the Church appears to be traceable to Peter Lombard (d. 1164), who, in the Fourth Book of his "Sentences," gives the name in its narrower sense to those seven ordinances which were subsequently recognised, at the Council of Florence (1430), and at the Council of Trent, as *the* Sacraments of the Church.[1]

See Canon I. of Session VII. of the COUNCIL OF TRENT (March 1547):—

> "Si quis dixerit, Sacramenta novae legis non fuisse omnia a Jesu Christo Domino nostro instituta; aut esse plura vel pauciora quam septem, videlicet: Baptismum, Confirmationem, Eucharistiam, Poenitentiam, Extremam Unctionem, Ordinem, et Matrimonium; aut etiam aliquod horum septem non esse vere et proprie Sacramentum; anathema sit."

Cf. the CREED OF POPE PIUS IV.:—

> "Profiteor quoque septem esse vere et proprie Sacramenta novae legis, a Jesu Christo, Domino nostro, instituta, atque ad salutem humani generis, licet non omnia singulis necessaria . . . illaque gratiam conferre."

The Eastern Church also recognises the same Seven Sacraments. See, *e.g.*, the "Holy Cathechism" by N. Bernardaces (p. 22):—

> "*Q.* How many Mysteries are there, and what are they?
> "*A.* Seven—(1) Baptism; (2) Unction or Holy Ointment;[2] (3) the Eucharist or Holy Communion; (4) Penance or Confession; (5) Holy Orders; (6) Marriage; and (7) Prayer-oil."[3]

The formularies of the Lutheran or Saxon school, when dealing with the Sacraments, treat of two only, but at the same time

[1] In England the BISHOPS' BOOK (1537) and the KING'S BOOK (1543) acknowledged the Seven Sacraments.

[2] Corresponding to our Confirmation.

[3] *I.e.*, or anointing the sick.

they do not, as a rule, expressly exclude the other five ordinances from the number of the Sacraments. The WURTEMBURG CONFESSION, however, argues at length against the reception of these five as Sacraments of the Church.

The Confessions of the "Reformed" departed much further in this matter, as in most other points, from the position of the Roman Church. The number of Sacraments is by them more expressly limited to two:—

Cf. FRENCH CONFESSION, Art. XXXV.:

"Agnoscimus duo tantum Sacramenta toti Ecclesiae communia."

SCOTCH CONFESSION, Art. XXI.:

"Nunc tempore Evangelii, nos duo solum habere praecipua a Christo instituta Sacramenta, agnoscimus et confitemur, quae ab omnibus illis utenda praecipiuntur, qui volunt corporis ipsius membra haberi, scilicet Baptismus et Coena vel mensa Domini, quae vulgo communio Corporis et Sanguinis ejus vocatur."

BELGIC CONFESSION, Art. XXXIII.:

"Praeterea sufficit nobis is Sacramentorum numerus, quem Christus ipse verus et unicus Doctor noster instituit. Sunt vero illa duo duntaxat, nimirum Sacramentum Baptismi, et sacrae Coenae Domini nostri Jesu Christi."

The SECOND HELVETIC CONFESSION, while it affirms (in Article XIX.) that there are only two Sacraments of the Church, goes on to speak in very disparaging terms of some of those other ordinances which were counted as Sacraments in the times preceding the Reformation:—

"Novi populi Sacramenta sunt Baptismus et Coena Dominica. Sunt qui sacramenta novi populi septem numerent. Ex quibus nos poenitentiam, ordinationem ministrorum, non papisticam quidem illam, sed apostolicam, et matrimonium, agnoscimus instituta esse Dei utilia, sed non sacramenta. Confirmatio et Extrema unctio, inventa sunt hominum, quibus nullo cum damno carere potest ecclesia. Neque illa nos in nostris ecclesiis habemus. Nam habent illa quaedam, quae minime probare possumus."

(3.) THE FIVE SACRAMENTAL ORDINANCES.

Those five, commonly called Sacraments, that is to say, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction, are not to be counted for Sacraments of the Gospel.

Besides the two great Sacraments ordained by Christ, there are other ordinances of the Church which have a sacramental nature (*i.e.*, which are "an outward and

visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace"), and are therefore "**commonly called Sacraments**"; yet they are not to be put upon the same level with Baptism and the Holy Eucharist; they **have not like nature of Sacraments with Baptism and the Lord's Supper, for that they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God.** Although the two great Sacraments are thus separated from the other five ordinances named, sacramental character is not denied to these ordinances; on the other hand, the writers of our formularies acknowledge or imply, in several passages, that they are in some sense Sacraments. See, *e.g.*:—

Homily of Swearing, Part I. (p. 74):—

"By like holy promise the Sacrament of Matrimony knitteth man and wife in perpetual love."

Homily of Common Prayer and Sacraments (p. 377):—

"For this visible sign, I mean laying on of hands, is not expressly commanded in the New Testament to be used in Absolution, as the visible signs in Baptism and the Lord's Supper are; and therefore Absolution is no such Sacrament as Baptism and the Communion are. And, though the Ordering of Ministers hath his visible sign and promise, yet it lacks the promise of remission of sin, as all other Sacraments besides do. Therefore neither it nor any other Sacrament else be such Sacraments as Baptism and the Communion are."

We must now proceed to speak a little more in detail of the five Ordinances named in the Article, and to indicate the position they occupy in the system of our Church.

(A.) **Confirmation.**

The name "Confirmation" is traced by some to S. Ambrose,[1] but does not seem to have been in common use before the sixth century.[2]

In the New Testament we have mention of the ordinance

[1] *Cf.* "De Mysterii," vii. 42:—

"Ye have received the spiritual seal. . . . God the Father hath signed you, Christ our Lord hath confirmed you, and, as ye are taught by the apostolic lection, hath given you the pledge of the Spirit in your hearts."

[2] Probably the earliest example of the unqualified use of the title "Confirmation," of which we can definitely fix the date, occurs in a treatise of Paschasius, a deacon of Rome (d. 512 A.D.). That writer, alluding to Acts xix. 4–6, says:—

"See how great is the power of the Holy Spirit! In Baptism is bestowed the remission of sins; in the coming of the Holy Spirit gifts of supernatural powers are conferred, and miraculous signs are performed by the confirmed" ("De Spiritu Sancto," ii. 4).

itself as administered by the Apostles to the newly baptized. In Acts viii. 14–17 we read that SS. Peter and John were sent to Samaria, and that by imposition of their hands a special gift of the Holy Ghost was imparted to those who had been previously baptized by Philip. Again, in Acts xix. 4–6 we read of special gifts of the Spirit through the imposition of S. Paul's hands upon those whom he had previously baptized. See also Heb. vi. 2, where the "laying on of hands" is spoken of, and apparently connected with Baptism.

In early Christian literature the ordinance is usually called "Chrism,"[1] or anointing, and "the Seal."

The outward sign in Confirmation is the laying on of hands; the inward grace, a special gift of the Holy Spirit. The spiritual life, having been begun in Baptism, is strengthened by the imparting the plenary gift of the Holy Spirit to those confirmed. The Church therefore gives a special injunction to the Godparents at the close of the Baptismal Service:—

> "Ye are to take care that this Child be brought to the Bishop to be confirmed by him." . . .

In the East the "Chrism" has always been ministered with Baptism, but in the Western Church Baptism and Confirmation have been separated for nearly a thousand years. This dissociation of the two rites may be traced to two causes:—

(*a.*) In the early Church Baptism was normally administered at special seasons (Easter and Pentecost), in the presence of the Bishop, and the baptized were then confirmed immediately upon leaving the font. The extension of the administration of Baptism to other times, when the Bishop, who alone could confirm,[2] was not present, led to the separation of the two ordinances, Confirmation being administered, as it now is, by the Bishop in periodical visits.[3]

[1] This is the usual name in the Eastern Church at the present day; *cf.* "Orthodox Confession" (p. 161):—

Τὸ δεύτερον μυστήριον εἶναι τὸ μύρον τοῦ χρίσματος.

[2] Exceptions have been allowed to this, especially in the Eastern Church, where Confirmation may be validly administered by every priest, though the Chrism must have been consecrated by a bishop. Tradition, however, from the first points to the Bishop as the minister of this ordinance, and in the passages of the New Testament already referred to it is recorded as administered by Apostles alone.

[3] The 60th CANON (of 1604) orders the Bishop, or his Suffragan, to confirm at the customary triennial visitation, but in modern times it has been found necessary to hold "Confirmations" more frequently.

(*b.*) The growth of the practice of Infant Baptism also contributed to the dissociation of that Sacrament from Confirmation, it being felt that the latter rite was scarcely applicable in its full significance to the baptized infant.

In the English Church, since 1662, a renewal of Baptismal vows has been required of the Candidate before Confirmation, a feature peculiar to the English rite. We must not, of course, fall into the error of supposing that personal responsibility begins with the day of Confirmation; on the contrary, in the Baptismal Office, the Godparents are exhorted:—

> "Ye must remember, that it is your parts and duties to see that this infant be taught, so soon as he shall be able to learn, what a solemn vow, promise, and profession, he hath here made by you."

From what has been said it is clear that our Church regards "Confirmation" as of perpetual obligation, and gives it a very important place in the spiritual life of her children.[1]

With the position taken up by the Church of England we may contrast what is said in some of the Continental Confessions of the Reformation period:—

Saxon Confession, Art. XIX.:

> "In ritu confirmationis, fiebat exploratio doctrinae, in qua singuli recitabant summam doctrinae, et palam profitebantur se improbare furores ethnicos et haereticos, et velle se esse et manere verae Ecclesiae membra, et non discessuros a vera sententia, quam tunc profitebantur. Hic mos erat utilis ad erudiendos homines, et retinendos in vera agnitione Dei. Ac in ecclesiis nostris similia fiunt in catechesi juniorum, et in privata confessione, in qua pastores doctrinam populi explorant. Sed ritus confirmationis, quem nunc episcopi retinent, quid est nisi inanis umbra?"

Wurtemburg Confession, Art. XI.:

> "Non est nobis dubium, quin Apostoli initio revelati et confirmati in die Pentecostes Evangelii, contulerint impositione manuum admirandum donum Spiritus sancti credentibus in Christum, ut variis linguis loquerentur. Et sentimus utilissi-

---

[1] In addition to being (*a*) a strengthening of the spiritual life, begun in Baptism, by the special gift of the Holy Spirit, and (*b*) a solemn renewal of Baptismal vows, Confirmation is also (*c*) the entrance to the full privileges of membership in the Church. See the rubric at the end of the "Order of Confirmation:—

> "And there shall none be admitted to the Holy Communion, until such time as he be confirmed, or be ready and desirous to be confirmed."

mum esse, ut pueri et adolescentes a Pastoribus Ecclesiae suae in Catechismo examinentur, et si quidem pie ac recte fuerint eruditi, approbentur; si vero prave, emendentur. Sed ex personali et temporali facto Apostolorum non est absque certo mandato Dei generale et perpetuum Sacramentum in Ecclesia statuendum."

The estimation in which Confirmation is held by the Church of England may be further illustrated from the answer of the Bishops to the Puritan objections to the "Order of Confirmation" in 1661. Exception was taken to the wording of the "Collect," the Puritans stating their objections thus:—

"We desire that the practice of the Apostles may not be alleged as a ground of this imposition of hands for the confirmation of children, both because the Apostles did never use it in that case, as also because the Articles of the Church of England declare it to be a 'corrupt imitation of the Apostles' practice' (Acts xxv.).

"We desire that imposition of hands may not be made, as here it is, a sign to certify children of God's grace and favour towards them; because this seems to speak it a sacrament, and is contrary to that fore-mentioned 25th Article, which saith that 'confirmation hath no visible sign appointed by God.'"

To this the Bishops replied:—

"Prayer after the imposition of hands is grounded upon the practice of the Apostles (Heb. vi. 2, and Acts viii. 17); nor doth 25th Article say that confirmation is a corrupt imitation of the Apostles' practice, but that the five commonly called Sacraments have ground partly of the corrupt following the Apostles, &c., which may be applied to some other of these five, but cannot be applied to confirmation, unless we make the Church speak contradictions."

(B.) **Penance.**

The inward grace of this Sacramental Ordinance is promised by our Lord Himself (S. John xx. 22, 23), but it is not recorded in the New Testament that the grace of Absolution was attached by our Lord to any special outward sign, and on this ground the writers of our Article refused to place Penance on the same level with Baptism and the Holy Eucharist.

Cf. the HOMILY FOR WHITSUNDAY:—

"Christ ordained the authority of the keys to excommunicate notorious sinners, and to absolve them which are truly penitent' (p. 495).

Also the HOMILY OF COMMON PRAYER AND SACRAMENTS:—

> "For, although Absolution hath the promise of forgiveness of sin, yet by the express word of the New Testament it hath not this promise annexed and tied to the visible sign, which is imposition of hands. For this visible sign, I mean laying on of hands, is not expressly commanded in the New Testament to be used in Absolution, as the visible signs in Baptism and the Lord's Supper are; and therefore Absolution is no such Sacrament as Baptism and the Communion are" (pp. 376, 377).

At first Confession was made publicly before the Church, such open confession being necessary before the guilty person could be admitted again into the communion of the Church. At a very early period,[1] however, it was recommended that penitents should confess their sins privately to a spiritual adviser, who might judge of the expediency of public confession and penance, if likely to tend to the quieting of the penitent's conscience and the edification of the Church. This "godly discipline" of the Primitive Church had a twofold character—

(*a*) It was the regular form for the readmission of the penitent to Church communion and sacramental privileges.

(*b*) It had also for its express object the reassurance of the troubled conscience of the offender himself.

When the primitive disciplinary system of the Church fell into disuse,[2] that part of the Absolution which concerned authoritative restoration to Holy Communion also ceased to be used, but the reassurance of the conscience of the penitent by God's pardon being conveyed to him through the definite outward act of the Ministry of the Church was in no way affected by the cessation of the public discipline. The power of Absolution conferred upon the Ministry by the ordaining words of Christ Himself lasted on, when the primitive disciplinary system had passed away.

This power of Absolution the Church of England still claims for her priests; for—

(*a*) She has deliberately retained in her formula of Ordination

[1] *Cf.*, *e.g.*, Origen on Ps. xxxvii. Hom. 2:—

> "Tantummodo circumspice diligentius cui debeas confiteri peccatum tuum. . . . Si intellexerit et praeviderit talem esse languorem tuum qui in conventu totius Ecclesiae exponi debeat et curari, ex quo fortassis et caeteri aedificari poterunt, et tu ipse facile sanari." . . .

[2] In the fifth century Pope Leo the Great directed that both confession and penance should take place in private under the direction of a priest; and in the seventh century all public penance was discontinued, a result largely owing to the publication of the '*Penitential*' of Theodore of Tarsus, Archbishop of Canterbury.

of Priests those very words of Christ, which have ever been understood by all to be the basis of the power of Absolution :—

"Receive the Holy Ghost for the Office and Work of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the Imposition of our hands. Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven ; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained."

(*b*) Provision is made in the Church's system for the exercise of this power conferred at Ordination—

(i.) In the Absolution pronounced by the priest at Morning and Evening Prayer, and in the Communion Service.

(ii.) Besides providing forms of Absolution, to be pronounced, after General Confession, in the public services of the Church, the Church of England also authorises Private Confession.

See the First Exhortation in the COMMUNION SERVICE :—

"If there be any of you, who by this means cannot quiet his own conscience herein, but requireth further comfort or counsel, let him come to me, or to some other discreet and learned Minister of God's Word, and open his grief ; that by the ministry of God's Holy Word he may receive the benefit of absolution, together with ghostly counsel and advice, to the quieting of his conscience, and avoiding of all scruple and doubtfulness."

Cf. the Office for the VISITATION OF THE SICK :—

"Here shall the sick person be moved to make a special Confession of his sins, if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter. After which Confession, the priest shall absolve him (if he humbly and heartily desire it) after this sort :—

"Our Lord Jesus Christ, Who hath left power to His Church to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in Him, of His great mercy forgive thee thine offences : And by His authority committed to me, I absolve thee from all thy sins, In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen."

If we are to be loyal to our Church we must strenuously resist those who would altogether deprive us of the great help to the spiritual life which special private Confession and Absolution affords. The Church of England does not set forth such special Confession as necessary to salvation, or of necessity obligatory upon all her members, but as voluntary, and to be used by her

children as they feel their need;[1] at the same time, however, it is obvious that God has given us means of grace in His Church that we may duly use them. Private Confession is therefore distinctly recommended for such as feel scruples about coming to Communion on account of a disquieted conscience,[2] and is enjoined upon a sick person whose conscience is troubled with any weighty matter.[3]

That our Church, since the Reformation, intends to retain the practice of private Confession is also clear from the words of CANON 113 (1604):—

> "Provided always, that if any man confess his secret and hidden sins to the Minister, for the unburdening of his conscience, and to receive spiritual consolation and ease of mind from him; we do not any way bind the said Minister by this our Constitution, but do straightly charge and admonish him, that he do not at any time reveal and make known to any person whatsoever any crime or offence so committed to his trust and secrecy (except they be such crimes as by the laws of this realm his own life may be called into question for concealing the same), under pain of irregularity."

It should be noted that Confession is not the main subject of this Canon, which deals with the matter of presentation of crimes, &c., to the ordinary, and is entitled "Ministers may present"; but the manner in which Confession is incidentally alluded to

[1] The Church of England in this differs from the Church of Rome, which regards Penance as a true and proper Sacrament in the narrow sense of the term, and necessary to salvation. *Cf.* the following Canons of Session XIV. of the COUNCIL OF TRENT:—

I. "Si quis dixerit, in Catholica Ecclesia, Poenitentiam non esse vere et proprie Sacramentum pro fidelibus, quoties post baptismum in peccata labuntur, ipsi Deo reconciliandis, a Christo Domino nostro institutum; anathema sit."

VI. "Si quis negaverit, Confessionem Sacramentalem vel institutam, vel ad salutem necessariam esse jure divino; aut dixerit, modum secrete confitendi soli sacerdoti, quem Ecclesia Catholica ab initio semper observavit et observat, alienum esse ab institutione et mandato Christi, et inventum esse humanum; anathema sit."

VII. "Si quis dixerit, in Sacramento Poenitentiae, ad remissionem peccatorum necessarium non esse jure divino, confiteri omnia et singula peccata mortalia . . . aut demum, non licere confiteri peccata venalia; anathema sit."

VIII. "Si quis dixerit, confessionem omnium peccatorum, qualem Ecclesia servat, esse impossibilem, et traditionem humanam, a piis abolendam; aut ad eam non teneri omnes et singulos utriusque sexus Christi fideles, juxta magni Concilii Lateranensis constitutionem, semel in anno, et ob id suadendum esse Christi fidelibus, ut non confiteantur tempore Quadragesimae; anathema sit."

[2] See the Exhortation in the Communion Service quoted above.

[3] See the passage quoted above from the Order for the Visitation of the Sick.

affords conclusive testimony to the fact that Confession of "secret and hidden sin" to the Minister was assumed by the clergy of that day (1604) as quite a regular and normal thing in the Church of England.

The formularies of the Lutheran or Protestant Reformers retain the practice of private Confession and Absolution, with certain safeguards and stipulations:—

Augsburg Confession, Part II. Art. IV.:

"Confessio in ecclesiis apud nos non est abolita. . . . Sed de confessione docent quod enumeratio delictorum non sit necessaria, nec sint onerandae conscientiae cura enumerandi omnia delicta, quia impossibile est omnia delicta recitare."

Saxon Confession, Art. XVI.:

"De confessione privata facienda pastoribus, adfirmamus ritum privatae absolutionis in Ecclesia retinendum esse; et constanter retinemus, propter multas graves causas. Sed simul docemus, non praecipiendam esse, nec postulandam enumerationem delictorum in illo privato colloquio."

Wurtemburg Confession, Art. XIV.:

"Etsi autem sentimus, enumerationem peccatorum coram sacerdote non esse necessariam ad salutem, nec esse aliquod meritum remissionis peccatorum, tamen damus operam, ut generalis confessio peccatorum quantum fieri potest et licet, in Ecclesiis nostris conservetur, idque duabus de causis. Una est, ut hoc privato colloquio rudiores de rebus necessariis admoneantur et erudiantur. Altera, ut hac occasione privatim audiatur Evangelion Christi, de remissione peccatorum, quod Evangelion est vera clavis regni coelorum, et absolutio a peccatis, et ut per auditum Evangelii, seu absolutionis, fides vel concipiatur, vel confirmetur."

The formularies influenced or drawn up by theologians of the Swiss school for the most part speak strongly against the retention of private confession to a priest; *e.g.*:—

Tetrapolitan Confession, Art. XX.:

"Nam innumeras animas illa de peccatis sacerdoti confitendis constitutio, in gravem desperationem adegit, totque aliis vitiis obnoxia est, ut pridem abrogari debuerit."

Second Helvetic Confession, Art. XIV.:

"Credimus autem hanc confessionem ingenuam, quae soli Deo fit, vel privatim inter Deum et peccatorem, vel palam in templo, ubi generalis illa peccatorum confessio recitatur, sufficere, nec necessarium esse ad remissionem peccatorum consequendam, ut

quis peccata sua confiteatur sacerdoti, susurrando in aures ipsius, ut vicissim cum impositione manuum ejus audiat ab ipso absolutionem: quod ejus rei nec praeceptum ullum, nec exemplum exstet in scripturis sacris. . . . Rite itaque et efficaciter ministri absolvunt, dum evangelium Christi, et in hoc remissionem peccatorum, quae singulis promittitur fidelibus, sicuti et singuli sunt baptizati, praedicant, et ad singulos peculiariter pertinere testantur. Nec putamus absolutionem hanc efficaciorem fieri, per hoc, quod in aurem alicui, aut super caput alicujus singulariter inmurmuratur."

(C.) **Orders.**

The outward sign is the laying on of hands (see Acts vi. 6, xiii. 3; 1 Tim. iv. 14; 2 Tim. i. 6); the inward grace is a special gift of the Holy Ghost for the work of the Ministry. See the passages in 1 and 2 Tim. referred to, which clearly imply that a spiritual gift passed to Timothy through, and simultaneously with, the imposition of hands.

Cf. the ORDINAL:—

"When this Prayer is done, the Bishop with the Priests present shall lay their hands severally upon the head of every one that receiveth the Order of Priesthood; the Receivers humbly kneeling upon their knees, and the Bishop saying,

"Receive the Holy Ghost for the Office and Work of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the Imposition of our hands. . . ."

The words thus recited in the act of Ordination are a prayer, but a prayer which the Church is assured it is God's will to grant; they are spoken, therefore, in sure confidence that the gift accompanies the outward sign.[1]

[On the subject of "Orders" see further the notes on Articles XXIII. and XXXVI.]

(D.) **Matrimony.**

See Eph. v. 31, 32, in the Vulgate:—

"Propter hoc relinquet homo patrem, et matrem suam, et adhaerebit uxori suae; et erunt duo in carne una. Sacramentum hoc magnum est."

---

[1] Calvin was willing to give the name of "Sacrament" to "Orders." See, *e.g.*, INSTITUTES, IV. xix. 28:—

"Quantum ad verum presbyterii munus attinet, quod ore Christi nobis est commendatum, libentur eo loco (scil. Sacramenti) habeo. Illic enim ceremonia est, primum ex Scripturis sumpta, deinde quam non esse inanem nec supervacuam, sed fidele spiritualis gratiae symbolum, testatur Paulus."

Holy Scripture dwells upon—

(*a*) The Divine Institution of Matrimony (S. Matt. xix. 4–6; Eph. v. 31).

Cf. the opening address in the Marriage Service, where Holy Matrimony is spoken of as "an honourable estate, instituted of God in the time of man's innocency."

(*b*) The deep mystery of the union of man and wife in marriage (Eph. v. 32).[1]

The paramount sacredness of marriage is, as all history shows, "a mystery," *i.e.*, a secret of God's law, fully revealed in Christ. In heathen thought marriage has ever been a contract far less sacred than the indissoluble tie of blood, and wherever Christian principle is renounced or obscured that idea recurs in modern times.

(*c*) The high dignity of Matrimony as "signifying unto us the mystical union that is betwixt Christ and His Church" (see Exhortation at the commencement of the Marriage Service, and *cf.* Eph. v. 23 *et seqq.*).

(*d*) The indissolubility of the Marriage tie.

This is distinctly affirmed by our Lord (S. Matt. xix. 4–6; S. Mark x. 6–9), and emphasised in the most striking manner in that part of the Marriage Service where it is directed—

> "Then shall the Priest join their right hands together, and say, "Those whom God hath joined together let no man put asunder."

Cf. also the Betrothal portion of the Service, where each of the contracting parties plights troth to the other—

> "till death us do part."

The indissoluble character of the Marriage bond is again affirmed in the third Collect of the Post-Matrimonial part of the Service:—

> "O God, who . . . knitting them together, didst teach that it should never be lawful to put asunder those whom thou by Matrimony hast made one."

Divorce, therefore, is altogether inconsistent with the Divine Institution of Matrimony. It is true that it was allowed by the

[1] It cannot be doubted that in Eph. v. 32 the word μυστήριον (= Sacramentum) applies to the type (the mutual relation of husband and wife) as well as to the Antitype (the mutual relation of Christ and His Church).

Jewish Law, but the legislation of Moses was in this respect imperfect, because of the imperfection of those for whose sake it was given (S. Matt. xix. 7, 8). Separation *a mensa et thoro*, for the grave cause of adultery, is of course allowed, in accordance with our Lord's special exception (S. Matt. v. 32, xix. 9); but the *vinculum matrimonii* is in no way dissolved by such separation, nor may either of those so living apart from one another, even though the innocent party, marry again before the other's death (*cf.* Rom. vii. 2, 3; 1 Cor. vii. 39). Re-marriage of one party before the death of the other is (according to the original Divine Institution, upon which Christ has re-established Matrimony) nothing else than adultery (S. Matt. xix. 9; S. Mark x. 11, 12; S. Luke xvi. 18; Rom. vii. 3).[1]

(E.) **Extreme Unction.**

See S. Mark vi. 13; S. Jas. v. 14, 15.

In the former passage the anointing of the sick with oil is connected with bodily healing; in the latter, solemn anointing with prayer is connected with bodily healing and with forgiveness of sins.

Unction with oil, of a Sacramental character, has certainly been in use in the Church from the very earliest times. A solemn anointing of the sick is still practised in the Eastern Church, professedly as a means of healing; it is called "Holy Oil," or "Prayer-Oil" (Τὸ εὐχέλαιον), and is administered by a number of priests conjointly (varying from three to seven).[2]

---

[1] The mind of our Church is shown in CANON 107 (of 1604):—

> "In all sentences for Divorce, Bond to be taken for not marrying during each other's Life."

Cf. COUNCIL OF TRENT, Session XXIV. Canon vii.:—

> "Si quis dixerit, Ecclesiam errare, cum docuit, et docet, juxta Evangelicam et Apostolicam doctrinam, propter adulterium alterius conjugum matrimonii vinculum non posse dissolvi; et utrumque, vel etiam innocentem, qui causam adulterio non dedit, non posse, altero conjuge vivente, aliud matrimonium contrahere; moecharique eum, qui dimissa adultera aliam duxerit, et eam, quae dimisso adultero alii nupserit; anathema sit."

The authorities of the Greek Church allow *divorce* on ground of adultery, and also allow re-marriage to the innocent party. The Protestant and Reformed Confessions do not treat of this matter fully, but the Continental Reformers were inclined to allow re-marriage to the innocent divorced party. *Cf.*, *e.g.*, SAXON CONFESSION, Art. XVIII.:—

> "Personae innocenti, cum re cognita pronunciatur esse libera, non prohibetur conjugium."

[2] This is in literal conformity with S. Jas. v. 14: *προσκαλεσάσθω τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους τῆς ἐκκλησίας.*

Cf. the "Holy Catechism" (Orthodox Eastern Church) by Bernadaces:—

> "*Q.* What is the seventh Mystery, and what is its operation?
>
> "*A.* The seventh Mystery is the Prayer-Oil, in which the sick man is anointed with oil, and the priest invokes the Divine Grace, which heals the weaknesses of soul and body" (p. 28).

In the West a new theory grew up with Scholasticism. It was seen that bodily healing did not always follow upon the anointing of the sick, and the operation of the accompanying grace of Unction was therefore transferred from the physical to the spiritual sphere. In the twelfth century the term "Extreme Unction" came into use, and the Council of Trent limited the solemn anointing to those who are near death:—

> "Declaratur etiam, esse hanc Unctionem infirmis adhibendam, illis vero praesertim, qui tam periculose decumbunt, ut in exitu vitae constituti videantur: unde et Sacramentum exeuntium nuncupatur" (Session XIV. Cap. iii.).

In the Prayer Book of 1549 the Anointing of the sick was retained, and an attempt made to restore its primitive aspect:—

> "If the sicke person desyre to be annoynted, then shal the prieste annoynte him upon the forehead or breast only, makyng the signe of the crosse, saying thus,
>
> "As with this visible oyle thy body outwardly is annoynted: so our heauenly father, almyghtye God, graunte of his infinite goodnesse, that thy soule inwardly may be annoynted with the holy gost, who is the spirite of al strength, coumforte, reliefe, and gladnesse. And vouchesafe for his great mercy (yf it be his blessed will) to restore unto thee thy bodely helth, and strength, to serue him, and sende thee release of al thy paines, troubles, and diseases, both in body and minde. And howsoeuer his goodnesse (by his diuyne and unsearchable prouidēce) shall dispose of thee: we, his unworthy ministers and seruaūts, humbly beseche the eternall majestie, to doe with thee according to the multitude of his innumerable mercies, and to pardon thee all thy sinnes and offences, committed by all thy bodily senses, passions, and carnall affeccions: who also vouchsafe mercifully to graūt unto thee gostely strēgth, by his holy spirite, to withstād and ouercome al temptacions and assaultes of thine aduersarye, that in no wise he preuaile against thee, but that thou mayest haue perfit victory and triumph against the deuil, sinne, and death, through Christ our Lord: Who by his death hath ouercomed the Prince of death, and with the father, and the holy gost euermore liveth and reigneth God, worlde without ende. Amen."

In the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI. (1552) that part of the Visitation Office which referred to the Anointing was dropped, and it has not since been restored. Thus a practice undoubtedly Scriptural has ceased to be enjoined in the Church of England, and there has been lost an Apostolic ordinance, whereby, with the assurance of an outward and visible sign, the faithful were prayed over, for the forgiveness of their sins, and their restoration to health, or spiritual support in their sickness.

The Continental Reformers not only denied to Unction the dignity and title of a Sacrament, but for the most part urged the discontinuation of its observance:—

Calvin's Institutes, IV. xix. 18:

> "Ejusdem rationis est ista unctio, cujus esse manuum impositionem supra demonstravimus; nempe histrionica hypocrisis, qua citra rationem, et sine fructu, Apostolos referre volunt."

Saxon Confession, Art. XIX.:

> "Praeterea unctio, quae nunc extrema nominatur, fuit olim medicatio; ut ex Jacobi epistola perspicuum est. Nunc spectaculum est plenum superstitionis. Dicunt remitti peccata, per istas unctiones; et addunt invocationem mortuorum, quam etiam necesse est improbare. Ideo hi ritus non servantur in nostris ecclesiis, nec ante haec tempora Ecclesia sensit esse necessarios."

Wurtemburg Confession, Art. XXII.:

> "Fatemur Apostolos unxisse aegros oleo, qui et corporalem sanitatem consecuti sunt. Fatemur etiam Epistolam, quae inscribitur Iacobo, jubere Presbyteros Ecclesiae ad aegrotos vocari, ut ungant eos oleo, et orent pro ipsis, ad consequendam sanitatem. Sed haec tum utiliter exercebantur cum ministri Ecclesiae adhuc ornati erant dono aegrotos corporaliter et admirabiliter sanandi. Postquam autem hoc donum, confirmato Evangelio in Ecclesia, defuit, res ipsa testatur, hanc unctionis ceremoniam otiose nunc et inutiliter usurpari."

Second Helvetic Confession, Art. XXV.:

> "Papisticam visitationem cum sua illa unctione extrema, diximus superius, nos non approbare, quod absurda habeat, et a Scriptura canonica non approbetur."

Before we pass on to consider the concluding paragraph of Article XXV., we must note that in dealing with the five Sacra-

mental Ordinances the Article says that they are "**such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the Apostles, partly are states of life allowed in Scripture.**" The use of the word "partly" here would seem to imply that all five ordinances must fall into one or other of the two classes named. This, however, can scarcely be the sense intended, because, according to the principles of our leading Reformers, as expressed elsewhere, and according to the Prayer Book and Homilies, Confirmation, Penance, and Orders would not belong to either class. The words "have grown of the corrupt following of the Apostles" probably refer especially to Extreme Unction,[1] while the words "states of life allowed in Scripture" doubtless refer to Matrimony.

(4.) The Sacraments are to be used duly, and to be received worthily.

The Sacraments[2] were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, or to be carried about: but that we should duly use them. And in such only as worthily receive the same, they have a wholesome effect or operation; but they that receive them unworthily, purchase to themselves damnation, as S. Paul saith.

No one would think of supposing that the Sacraments

[1] The words may, however, have been intended, with a wider application, to refer to some of the other ordinances named, for we must remember that the writers of the Article had in view these ordinances as celebrated in the Western Church in the times immediately preceding the Reformation, when superstitious ceremonies, not traceable to their primitive and Apostolic institution, had been added to them.

[2] From its contents we should conclude that this last paragraph refers to the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist only. The expressions "*gazed upon*," "*carried about*," can only refer to this one Sacrament, and the passage of Scripture quoted has reference to it alone. How is it, then, that "Sacraments" are spoken of in the plural? Most likely the plural is used with reference to the two outward signs in this one Sacrament.

Cf. Second Exhortation in the Communion Service in the Prayer Book of 1559:—

> "Dearly beloved, forasmuch as our duty is to render to Almighty God our Heavenly Father, most hearty thanks for that he hath given his son our Saviour Jesus Christ, not only to die for us, but also to be our spiritual food and sustenance, as it is declared unto us, as well by God's word, as by the holy Sacraments of his blessed Body and Blood."

Queen Elizabeth's Injunctions, 1559:—

> "It is ordered for the more reverence to be given to these holy mysteries, being the Sacraments of the Body and Blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ." . . .

So also the Greek word "mysteries" (corresponding to the Latin "sacramenta") is used to denote the Eucharist alone:—

> "We who have duly received these holy mysteries" (Post-Communion Thanksgiving).

were ordained by Christ merely for exhibition, as a spectacle to onlookers; the end and object of their institution is the personal participation of the faithful. In order to such participation two conditions must be fulfilled:—

(*a*) The Sacraments must be **duly** (**rite**) **used**; *i.e.*, they must be "duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same" (Article XIX.);[1] there must be the matter, the form, and the minister (see notes, p. 131).

(*b*) They must be **worthily** (**digne**) received by us after due self-examination and fitting preparation.

Those who do not participate **rite** cannot be truly said to receive the Sacrament at all. Those who do not participate **digne** receive to themselves **damnationem** (*cf.* 1 Cor. xi. 29).

See further the notes on Article XXIX.

[1] *Cf.* the HOMILY OF THE WORTHY RECEIVING, &c., OF THE SACRAMENT:—

"But before all other things, this we must be sure of specially, that this Supper be in such wise done and ministered as our Lord and Saviour did and commanded to be done, as His holy Apostles used it, and the good fathers in the Primitive Church frequented it" (pp. 473, 474; ed. S.P.C.K.).

ARTICLE XXVI

OF THE UNWORTHINESS OF THE MINISTERS, WHICH HINDERS NOT THE EFFECT OF THE SACRAMENT.

Athough in the visible Church the evil be ever mingled with the good, and sometimes the evil have chief authority in the Ministration of the Word and Sacraments: yet forasmuch as they do not the same in their own name, but in Christ's, and do minister by His commission and authority, we may use their Ministry, both in hearing the Word of God, and in the receiving of the Sacraments. Neither is the effect of Christ's ordinance taken away by their wickedness, nor the grace of God's gifts diminished from such as by faith and rightly do receive the Sacraments ministered unto them, which be effectual because of Christ's institution and promise, although they be ministered by evil men.

Nevertheless, it appertaineth to the discipline of the Church, that inquiry be made of evil ministers, and that they be accused by those that have knowledge of their offences, and finally, being found guilty by just judgment, be deposed.

DE VI INSTITUTIONUM DIVINARUM QUOD EAM NON TOLLAT MALITIA MINISTRORUM.

Quamvis in Ecclesia visibili, *bonis mali* semper *sunt admixti, atque* interdum *ministerio Verbi et Sacramentorum* administrationi *praesint, tamen cum non suo sed Christi nomine* agant, ejusque *mandato et auctoritate ministrent, illorum ministerio uti licet,* cum *in Verbo Dei audiendo,* tum *in Sacramentis percipiendis.* Neque *per illorum malitiam effectus* institutorum Christi tollitur, *aut gratia donorum* Dei minuitur, quoad eos qui fide et *rite* sibi oblata percipiunt, quae *propter* institutionem *Christi* et *promissionem efficacia sunt,* licet *per malos* administrentur.

Ad Ecclesiae tamen disciplinam pertinet, ut in malos ministros inquiratur, accusenturque ab his, qui eorum flagitia noverint, atque tandem justo convicti judicio, deponantur.

§ 1.—*SOURCE.*

Much of the language of this Article is taken from Article V. of the XIII. ARTICLES of 1538 (words common to the two are

printed in *italics* in the Latin Version), which in turn was based to some extent upon Article VIII. of Part I. of the AUGSBURG CONFESSION :—

> "Quanquam ecclesia proprie sit congregatio sanctorum, et vere credentium; tamen, cum in hac vita multi hypocritae et mali admixti sint, licet uti sacramentis, quae per malos administrantur, juxta vocem Christi: Sedent Scribae et Pharisaei in cathedra Moisis, etc. Et sacramenta et verbum propter ordinationem et mandatum Christi sunt efficacia, etiamsi per malos exhibeantur. Damnant Donatistas et similes, qui negabant licere uti ministerio malorum in ecclesia, et sentiebant ministerium malorum inutile et inefficax esse."

§ 2.—*OBJECT.*

To repudiate the opinion of some of the sectaries of the day, that the validity of the Sacraments is destroyed by personal unfitness in the Minister.

The REFORMATIO LEGUM ("De Haeresibus," Cap. 15) speaks thus of the Anabaptists :—

> "Deinde ab Ecclesiae corpore se ipsi segregant, et ad sacrosanctam Domini mensam cum aliis recusant accedere, seque dicunt detineri vel ministrorum improbitate, vel aliorum fratrum."

The Donatists[1] (in North Africa, A.D. 311–415) acted upon the principle that no one who is excommunicated, or who *deserves to be excommunicated*, can validly perform any sacramental action; and this opinion was revived by Wiclif[2] (1324–1384), who seems to have held that a priest living in mortal sin is *ipso facto* degraded from his priesthood, so that all sacraments ministered by such an one are invalid. It is obvious that, according to this theory, no one would ever know for certain whether any sacrament was valid or not, because the state of the officiating Minister's soul can really be known to God alone.

[1] The Donatists are expressly condemned by name in the AUGSBURG CONFESSION (quoted above, § 1). *Cf.* also the SECOND HELVETIC CONFESSION, Art. XVIII. :—

> "Caeterum execramur in praesenti Donatistarum errorem, qui doctrinam et administrationem sacramentorum, vel efficacem vel inefficacem, ex mala vel bona ministrorum vita aestimant."

[2] A Council held at Blackfriars (1382) condemned a series of propositions embodying the doctrines of Wiclif; amongst them was the following :—

> "That if a bishop or a priest be in mortal sin he cannot ordain, consecrate, or baptize."

The Council of Trent (Session VII., March 1547) passed the following Canon (On the Sacraments, XI.):—

> "Si quis dixerit, in ministris, dum Sacramenta conficiunt et conferunt, non requiri intentionem saltem faciendi quod facit Ecclesia; anathema sit."

From this doctrine of the necessity of "intention"[1] on the part of the Minister, it follows that if he withhold his inward assent, either from personal unbelief, from ill-will, or whatever cause, the act is void and conveys no grace. Thus is the effect of the Sacraments made to depend upon the worthiness of the Minister.[2]

The Eastern Church holds that the validity of the Sacraments is in no way affected by unworthiness in the Minister.

Cf. the "Holy Catechism" (Orthodox Eastern Church) by Nicolas Bulgaris, where it is said of an unworthy Minister:—

> "Certainly he celebrates a Mystery, since he has, as we said, the seal of the Mystery of the Priesthood, and the stamp indelibly, and the Mysteries entirely take place through the grace of the All-Holy Spirit, and the Blood of endless power which was shed from Christ's side, that is through the supernatural power which Christ gave of the Mysteries being effected every day unto the end of the age. And this all the theologians in common assert, saying that the Mysteries do not proceed as from the agent, or as from the priest who celebrates them, but as from that which is performed, namely, as from the Mystery celebrated" (p. 26).

§ 3.—*EXPOSITION.*

(1.) In the Church the evil and good are mingled.

In the visible Church the evil be ever mingled with the good.

Our Lord illustrated the nature of the Church in many parables. The kingdom of heaven is likened by Him—

(*a*) To a field where tares are mingled with the wheat (S. Matt. xiii. 24–30).

[1] Previously to the Council of Trent the doctrine of "intention" was merely a scholastic opinion, but it has Papal sanction as early as 1439, when it appears in a bull of Eugenius IV.

[2] *Cf.* Bellarmine, "Disput. Controv. de Justific." (III. viii. 5):—

> "No one can be certain, with the certainty of faith, that he receives a true sacrament, because the sacrament cannot be valid without the intention of the minister, and no man can see another's intention."

(*b*) To a "net that was cast into the sea, and gathered of every kind" (*Ibid.* 47, 48).

(*c*) To a marriage feast to which the servants "gathered together all as many as they found, both bad and good" (*Ibid.* xxii. 8–14).

(2.) Even if the evil be in authority we may use their ministry, because the unworthiness of the Minister does not hinder the effect of the Sacrament.

Sometimes the evil have chief authority in the Ministration of the Word and Sacraments: yet forasmuch as they do not the same in their own name, but in Christ's, and do minister by His commission and authority, we may use their Ministry, both in hearing the Word of God, and in the receiving of the Sacraments. Neither is the effect of Christ's ordinance taken away by their wickedness, nor the grace of God's gifts diminished from such as by faith and rightly do receive the Sacraments ministered unto them, which be effectual because of Christ's institution and promise, although they be ministered by evil men.

The Ministers of the Church do not administer their own Sacraments, but Christ's, and the Church in receiving the Sacraments has respect unto Christ Himself, and not to the Minister, so that it receives them not so much from the Minister as from Christ Himself through the Minister (*cf.* 2 Cor. v. 20; 1 Cor. iii. 5–7; Acts iii. 12, 16; and see especially S. Matt. xxiii. 2, 3, where our Lord enjoins that the ministry of the Scribes and Pharisees, who were personally unworthy, is to be used in observing the precepts of the Mosaic Law). The virtue and efficacy of Sacraments, since it depends solely on "Christ's institution and promise," cannot be hindered by unworthiness in the Minister. The source of the spiritual blessing conveyed to the faithful recipient is Christ's promise, not the goodness of the Minister.[1]

(3.) Church discipline should provide for the removal of such Ministers as are proved to be unworthy.

Nevertheless, it appertaineth to the discipline of the Church, that inquiry be made of evil Ministers, and that they be accused by

[1] Very many passages in S. Augustine's treatise, "De Baptismo contra Donatistos," have an intimate bearing upon the subject of our Article; *e.g.* :—

"Baptismus vero Christi verbis evangelicis consecratus et per adulteros et in adulteris sanctus est, quamvis illi sunt impudici et immundi; quia ipsa ejus sanctitas pollui non potest, et in sacramento suo divina virtus assistit, sive ad salutem bene utentium, sive ad perniciem male utentium."

those that have knowledge of their offences, and finally, being found guilty by just judgment, be deposed.[1]

Some special prerogatives and responsibilities of Ministers are acknowledged not only by the Church, but by every sect; and even those who take a low view of the Ministry demand a high standard of life from those who are the selected Ministers of the Congregation. Much more, therefore, should this be the case with the Church, which regards the Priesthood of its Ministers as a delegation, not so much from the Body, but rather from the Priesthood of the Head, Jesus Christ (*cf.* Lev. x. 3; 1 Tim. iii. 2, 3; Tit. i. 7, 8). From the very earliest times provision has been made for the removal of unworthy Ministers, by whose conduct the holy Name of God is dishonoured and the consciences of the brethren offended (1 Tim. v. 1, 19, 20; vi. 3–5). It is a matter for much regret that the legal machinery for removing clergy of known evil life has in the English Church for so long a time been difficult to work. Recent legislation has, however, done something towards rendering it more effectual.

[1] *Cf.* Second Helvetic Confession, Art. XVIII.:—

"Atqui debet interim justa esse inter ministros disciplina. Inquirendum enim diligenter in doctrinam et vitam ministrorum in synodis. Corripiendi sunt peccantes a senioribus, et in viam reducendi, si sunt sanabiles, aut deponendi, et velut lupi abigendi sunt per veros pastores a grege Dominico, si sunt incurabiles."

ARTICLE XXVII

OF BAPTISM.

Baptism is not only a sign of profession, and mark of difference, whereby Christian men are discerned from others that be not christened; but it is also a sign of Regeneration or new Birth, whereby as by an instrument, they that receive Baptism rightly, are grafted into the Church; the promises of the forgiveness of sin, and of our adoption to be the sons of God, by the Holy Ghost are visibly signed and sealed; faith is confirmed, and grace increased, by virtue of Prayer unto God.

The Baptism of young children is in any wise to be retained in the Church, as most agreeable with the institution of Christ.

DE BAPTISMO.

Baptismus non est tantum professionis signum ac discriminis nota, qua Christiani a non Christianis discernantur, sed etiam est signum Regenerationis, per quod tanquam per instrumentum recte Baptismum suscipientes, Ecclesiae inseruntur, promissiones de remissione peccatorum atque adoptione nostra in filios Dei per Spiritum Sanctum visibiliter obsignantur, fides confirmatur, et vi divinae invocationis, gratia augetur.

Baptismus parvulorum omnino in Ecclesia retinendus est, ut qui cum Christi institutione optime congruat.

§ 1.—*SOURCE.*

This Article was composed by the English Reformers, and first appeared as the 28th of the XLII. Articles of 1553. The last paragraph then ran as follows:—

> "The custome of the Churche to christen yonge children, is to bee commended, and in any wise to bee reteined in the Churche."

The wording was altered to its present stronger form at the Elizabethan revision (1563). Whereas in the earlier draft it was simply stated that Infant Baptism is tenable as a Church custom, it is now declared to have a higher authority: it is "**most agreeable with the institution of Christ.**"

In the text of the Article as it stood in 1553 and 1563 the

Latin "signum Regenerationis" was represented in the English Version by "sign and seal of Regeneration." The words "and seal" were omitted in 1571. In this connection, however, we should note that the verb "obsignantur," a few lines lower down, is still rendered "signed and sealed."

§ 2.—*OBJECT.*

To declare the grace and blessings given in Baptism, in opposition to those who held the Sacrament to be simply a bare sign. It was, further, the object of those who recast the concluding paragraph in 1563 to make it plain that the English Church holds Infant Baptism to be the normal type of Baptism.

Although Infant Baptism is only expressly mentioned at the close of the Article, indications are not wanting which show that the compilers of the former part, in speaking of Baptism, had the Baptism of Infants in view. Thus in the clause "recte Baptismum suscipientes Ecclesiae inseruntur" we cannot help remarking that only the objective qualification (recte) is mentioned, while the subjective qualifications (digne, cum fide) are not given here, as they are in the next Article. This fact points to the conclusion that the wording of the Article is concerned with the case of Infant Baptism only.

§ 3.—*EXPOSITION.*

The Act of Baptism.

The Greek words *βαπτίζω*, *βαπτισμός*, denote, in the language of Scripture, any washing, whether by dipping or pouring; see, *e.g.*, S. Mark vii. 4; S. Luke xi. 38. The outward act in the Sacrament significantly points to the inward grace—as the filth of the body is removed by washing with water, so are the stains of the soul by remission of sins; and, if we follow the Baptismal Ritual of the early Church, the immersion and rising again from the water of the Font symbolises our death and burial with Christ, and our rising again to newness of life with Him (Rom. vi. 3–5).[1]

Immersion in Baptism has fallen into disuse in our cold climate, but it should be remembered that it is still stated in

[1] *Cf.* the Church Catechism, where the inward and spiritual grace of the Sacrament is explained as "a death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness."

our Baptismal Office to be the normal and desirable mode of Baptism:—

> "And then naming it after them (if they shall certify him that the Child may well endure it), he shall dip it in the Water discreetly and warily, saying, . . .
>
> "But if they certify that the Child is weak, it shall suffice to pour Water upon it, saying the foresaid words."[1]

We now proceed to analyse the contents of the Article.

(1.) Baptism is a sign of our profession.

Baptism is . . . a sign of profession, and mark of difference, whereby Christian men are discerned from others that be not christened (qua Christiani a non Christianis discernantur).

In other words, Baptism makes a man a Christian; Christians are those incorporated into the Body of Christ by Baptism.

But it has been already laid down (in Article XXV., where see notes) that the Sacraments are more than badges or tokens. Baptism, therefore, has a higher significance.[2]

(2.) Baptism is a sign of Regeneration.

Baptism is not only a sign of profession . . . but it is also a sign of Regeneration or new Birth. (S. John iii. 5; Eph. v. 26; Tit. iii. 5.)

The immersion of a person, or the pouring of water upon

[1] *Cf.* what is said as to the manner of Baptism in the "Teaching of the Apostles," Cap. VII.:—

> "Περὶ δὲ τοῦ βαπτίσματος, οὕτω βαπτίσατε· ταῦτα πάντα προειπόντες, βαπτίσατε εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐν ὕδατι ζῶντι. Ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἔχῃς ὕδωρ ζῶν, εἰς ἄλλο ὕδωρ βάπτισον· εἰ δ' οὐ δύνασαι ἐν ψυχρῷ, ἐν θερμῷ. Ἐὰν δὲ ἀμφότερα μὴ ἔχῃς, ἔκχεον εἰς τὴν κεφαλὴν τρὶς ὕδωρ εἰς ὄνομα Πατρὸς καὶ Υἱοῦ καὶ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος."

Contrast the Second Baptist Confession, Art. XXIX.:—

> "Immersion or dipping of the person in water is necessary to the due administration of that ordinance."

The Church's Baptism is sometimes contemptuously spoken of as "sprinkling"; it ought not to be necessary to point out that the Church nowhere sanctions "sprinkling."

[2] Calvin (Institutes, IV. xv. 1) lays down that Baptism is not merely a sign:—

> "Proinde quibus visum est Baptismum non aliud esse quam tesseram ac notam qua religionem nostram apud homines profitemur, quomodo imperatoris sui insignia praeferunt milites, in suae professionis notam; ii quod primum erat in Baptismo non perpenderunt. Id vero est, quod a nobis accipiendus sit cum hac promissione, Quicunque crediderint, et baptizati, fuerint, salvos fore."

him in Baptism is the outward and visible *effectual*[1] sign, whereby is conveyed the inward and spiritual grace of Regeneration.[2] Thus in the CHURCH CATECHISM the grace given in Baptism is declared to be—

"A death unto sin, and a new birth unto righteousness."

See the following passages in the Baptismal Office:—

"We call upon thee for this Infant, that he, coming to thy holy Baptism, may receive remission of his sins by spiritual regeneration.

"Give thy holy Spirit to this Infant, that he may be born again."

After the act of Baptism the following words occur:—

"Seeing now, dearly beloved brethren, that this Child is regenerate, . . .

"We yield thee hearty thanks, most merciful Father, that it hath pleased thee to regenerate this Infant with thy holy Spirit."[3]

(3.) BY BAPTISM WE ARE GRAFTED INTO THE CHURCH, THE BODY OF CHRIST.

whereby, as by an instrument, they that receive Baptism rightly, are grafted into the Church (Rom. vi. 3–5; 1 Cor. xii. 13; Gal. iii. 27).

[1] See Article XXV.

[2] Hence "regenerated" and "baptized" may be used as synonymous and interchangeable terms. See notes on Article IX. § 4 (ii.), p. 77.

[3] The opinion of our Reformers as to Regeneration in Baptism may be illustrated by a few quotations:—

CRANMER, in his "Answer to Gardiner," writes thus:

"For if you understand the matter, would you resemble a knave playing in a prince's coat (in which nothing is inwardly wrought and altered) unto a man being baptized in water, who hath put upon him outwardly water, but inwardly is apparelled with Christ, and is, by the omnipotent working of God, spiritually regenerate, and changed into a new man" (Works, vol. iii. p. 487).

Again we read:

"Whosoever will be spiritually regenerated in Christ, he must be baptized himself" (Works, vol. ii. p. 455).

Similarly, in his CATECHISM, the same author says (p. 187):

"I trust you understand, good children, wherefore Baptism is called the bath of Regeneration, and how in Baptism we be born again, and made new creatures in Christ."

Cf. RIDLEY'S words (Works, p. 240):

"After that manner the water in Baptism hath grace promised, and by that grace the Holy Spirit is given: not that grace is included in water, but that grace cometh by water."

In direct contrast to the doctrine of the English Church stands the view of

See CHURCH CATECHISM :—

"In my Baptism; wherein I was made a member of Christ.

Cf. the following quotations from the Baptismal Office :—

"That of his bounteous mercy he will grant to this Child that thing which by nature he cannot have; that he may be baptized with Water and the Holy Ghost, and received into Christ's holy Church, and be made a lively member of the same."

"That he, being delivered from thy wrath, may be received into the ark of Christ's Church."

Immediately after the act of Baptism the Priest is directed to say—

"We receive this Child into the congregation of Christ's flock," &c.

"Seeing now, dearly beloved brethren, that this Child is regenerate and grafted into the body of Christ's Church."[1]

(4.) BY BAPTISM ARE VISIBLY SIGNED AND SEALED THE DIVINE PROMISES—

(*a.*) OF FORGIVENESS OF SINS;

(*b.*) OF OUR ADOPTION AS SONS OF GOD.

The promises of forgiveness of sin . . . are visibly signed and sealed. (Acts ii. 38, xxii. 16.)

In the NICENE CREED we "acknowledge one Baptism for the remission of sins."[2]

See the following passages in the Baptismal Office :—

"Who . . . by the Baptism of thy well-beloved Son, Jesus Christ, in the river Jordan, didst sanctify Water to the mystical washing away of sin."

"We call upon thee for this Infant, that he, coming to thy holy Baptism, may receive remission of his sins by spiritual regeneration."

---

the Continental Reformers of the Swiss school, as expressed in the CONSENSUS TIGURINUS, Art. XX.:

"Qui in prima infantia baptizati sunt, eos in pueritia vel ineunte adolescentia, interdum etiam senectute, regenerat Deus."

[1] RIDLEY writes thus :—

"The society or conjunction with Christ through the Holy Ghost is grace; and by the Sacrament we are made the members of the mystical body of Christ, for that by the Sacrament the part of the body is grafted in the head."

[2] According to Socinians, Baptism is *merely* a declaration or sealing, and not in any sense the instrument of Remission of sins. "Remissionis declarationem et obsignationem" is the expression of Socinus himself.

"Ye have prayed that our Lord Jesus Christ would vouchsafe to receive him, to release him of his sins."

"Regard, we beseech thee, the supplications of thy congregation; sanctify this Water to the mystical washing away of sin."

The promises . . . of our adoption to be the sons of God, by the Holy Ghost are visibly signed and sealed. (Gal. iii. 26, 27.)

See the CHURCH CATECHISM:—

"In my Baptism; wherein I was made . . . the child of God." [1]

Cf. the Thanksgiving in the Baptismal Office:—

"We yield thee hearty thanks, most merciful Father, that it hath pleased thee . . . to receive him for thine own Child by adoption."

The words "**by the Holy Ghost**" were first inserted in the English version of the Article in 1563, though the corresponding words "**per Spiritum Sanctum**" are found in the Latin text of 1553.

In the edition of 1563 the clause was printed thus:—

"Our adoption to be the sons of God, by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed."

As thus printed, the words "**by the Holy Ghost**" might be taken either in connection with the words that precede them or with the words following. As now commonly printed, the words are connected with the clause preceding, thus:—

"Our adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are visibly," &c.

In this case the words express the truth that our adoption as sons of God is connected with the gift of the Holy Spirit (*cf.* Rom. viii. 14–16; Gal. iv. 5, 6). But at the last authoritative revision of the Articles (1571) the pointing we have given above was adopted, a comma being placed after "**God**," and no stop after the words "**Holy Ghost.**" According to this punctuation, the clause is an express statement to the effect that the Holy Ghost is the Agent in Baptism (S. Mark i. 8; Tit. iii. 5).

[1] Contrast Calvin's teaching (INSTITUTES, IV. xv. 22):—

"Accedit postea sacramentum sigilli instar, non quod efficaciam Dei promissioni, quasi per se invalidae, conferat, sed eam duntaxat nobis confirmet. Unde sequitur, non ideo baptizari fidelium liberos, ut filii Dei tunc primum fiant qui ante alieni fuerint ab Ecclesia . . . quia promissionis beneficio jam ante ad Christi corpus pertinebant."

(5.) By Baptism faith is confirmed and grace increased.

Faith is confirmed, and grace increased, by virtue of prayer unto God (vi divinae invocationis).

It would seem that the description of the grace and significance of Baptism, as far as the person baptized is himself concerned, ends with the word "**sealed**" (after which a colon is placed in the edition of 1571), and that the clause following, with which we are now concerned, is intended to refer to the effect of the solemnisation of Baptism upon those present at the service. This view of the meaning of the Article is confirmed when we seek to parallel its phraseology (as we have done in the case of the earlier statements of the Article) from the Baptismal Office. The passage in the Office where "confirmation of faith" and "increase of grace" are spoken of has reference, not to the child baptized, but to the congregation present at the service. With the wording of the Article—

"*Faith is confirmed* and grace increased,"

cf. the wording of the Thanksgiving after the reading of the Gospel in the Baptismal Office :—

"Almighty and everlasting God, heavenly Father, we give thee humble thanks, for that thou hast vouchsafed to call us to the knowledge of thy grace, and *faith* in thee: increase this knowledge and *confirm this faith* in us evermore. Give thy holy Spirit to this Infant," &c.

It will be noted that as far as the word "evermore" the terms of the prayer are general, evidently referring to the whole congregation assembled; but from that point onward the prayer is concerned with the infant brought to Baptism. The coincidence of the wording of the Article with the wording of the prayer quoted can scarcely be accidental.

(6.) Infant Baptism is to be retained, and is declared to be most agreeable with the institution of Christ.

The Baptism of young children is in any wise to be retained in the Church, as most agreeable with the institution of Christ.

See S. Mark x. 13–16 (the passage read in the Baptismal Office). We there read of a spiritual blessing being given to unconscious infants[1] on the ground of the faith of those

[1] Παιδία is the word used in S. Mark, but the parallel passage (S. Luke xviii. 15) has βρέφη.

who brought them. The passage, therefore, has a very direct bearing upon the question of Infant Baptism. Our Lord by His action answered by anticipation the question, which of necessity was sure to arise, whether the New Covenant could take in unconscious infants, as the Old Covenant did; whether, when He was no longer upon earth, little children might be made partakers of His Blessing. Christ Himself made the answer to this question clear, both by word and deed. Not only is it the case that infants may come unto Him (S. Mark x. 14), but those who have reached mature years must become like little children in order that they may come unto Him (*Ibid. v.* 15; S. Matt. xviii. 3). Infant Baptism is, therefore, not merely allowable and justifiable, but it is, in the abstract, the normal pattern of Christian Baptism: "**cum Christi institutione optime congruat.**"

In the Baptismal Office we may see it stated how infants are qualified for Baptism.

(*a*) The opening exhortation begins thus:—

"Dearly beloved, forasmuch as all men are conceived and born in sin; and that our Saviour Christ saith, None can enter into the kingdom of God, except he be regenerate and born anew of Water and of the Holy Ghost," &c.

Since infants are born in Original Sin, Baptism is needful for their recovery.[1]

(*b*) Infants are also specially qualified to receive Baptism

[1] We should especially note the intimate connection between the denial of Original Sin and (i.) the refusal of Baptism to infants, or (ii.) the emptying of Infant Baptism of its true significance, and its retention merely as a ceremony of dedication to God. If the taint of Original Sin passes on to unconscious infants at birth, so also may the righteousness of Christ at the Font of new birth. On the other hand, if the taint of sin does not pass on to infants they do not need any regeneration, and Infant Baptism, with the significance which the Church teaches, is unnecessary.

Cf. X. ARTICLES, Art. II., on Baptism:—

"Infants must needs be christened because they be born in original sin."

XIII. ARTICLES, Art. VI.:—

"Quia vero infantes nascuntur cum peccato originis, habent opus remissione illius peccati, et illud ita remittitur (scil. per Baptismum) ut reatus tollatur."

KING'S BOOK:—

"But also it appertaineth and is offered unto infants, which, because they be born in original sin, have need and ought to be christened."

HERMANN'S CONSULTATIO:—

"Because they admit not original sinne, they (*i.e.*, the Anabaptists) also refuse the baptisme of children, and in as much as in them lyeth, they drawe awaye the moste parte of men from God and eternall salvation."

because of "their innocency," which Christ "exhorteth all men to follow" (see the address in the Office after the reading of the Gospel).

Since infants are free from actual sin, in their case no impediment is opposed to the operation of the grace of God in the Sacrament.

At the time of their Baptism infants, of course, have not as yet conscious faith or repentance, which are the necessary subjective qualifications in the recipient of the Sacrament [1]:—

> "Why then are Infants baptized, when by reason of their tender age they cannot perform them?
>
> "Because they promise them both by their sureties; which promise, when they come to age, themselves are bound to perform" (Church Catechism).

From the time that the Church of Christ was first set up on earth as a society,[2] Infant Baptism, although not universally adopted in practice,[3] was yet in theory almost universally believed to be right and proper. Tertullian, indeed, is found opposing it,[4] but S. Cyprian and sixty-six bishops assembled in council with him (A.D. 253) were in favour of Infant Baptism, the necessity and appropriateness of which they grounded upon the doctrine of Original Sin, and upon the words of our Lord recorded in the Gospels, supporting it also by reference to the admission of Hebrew infants into covenant with God by Circumcision.

At the Reformation period the Anabaptists rejected the practice

[1] In this connection it should be remembered that Circumision was of the nature of a Covenant (Gen. xvii. 9, 10, 14), but this circumstance did not prevent the Jewish child from being admitted into that Covenant before he was able consciously to perform the conditions.

[2] The Baptisms which followed upon the first proclamation of the Gospel were of necessity, for the most part, Adult Baptisms; but from the mention of the Baptism of whole households in such passages as Acts xvi. 15, 33; 1 Cor. i. 16, we gather that children of tender age, as well as persons of mature years, were baptized by the Apostles.

[3] Many, *e.g.*, voluntarily and purposely, postponed their Baptism, frequently even to their deathbed, in order that all the sins of their lives might be certainly removed by Baptismal grace, and in fear lest they should incur the guilt of post-Baptismal sin.

[4] *Cf.* Tertullian, "De Baptismo," Cap. xviii. :—

> "Itaque pro cujusque personae condicione ac dispositione, etiam aetate, cunctatio baptismi utilior est, praecipue tamen circa parvulos. . . . Ait quidem dominus, Nolite illos prohibere ad me venire. Veniant ergo, dum adolescunt; veniant, dum discunt, dum quo veniant docentur; fiant Christiani, cum Christum nosse potuerint. Quid festinat innocens aetas ad remissionem peccatorum?"

of Infant Baptism,[1] and many in England followed their error, as we gather from the provision of Stat. 32 Henry VIII. c. 49, § 11, by which they were excluded from the king's pardon who held "that infants ought not to be baptized, and if they be baptized, they ought to be re-baptized when they com to lawfull age."

Cf. Reformatio Legum, "De Haeresibus," Cap. 18:—

> "Deinde crudelis illorum impietas in baptismum irruit, quem infantibus impartiri nolunt, sed omnino nulla ratione."

See also Ridley's letter quoted in the notes on Article I., pp. 23, 24.

Objections are urged against Infant Baptism, and the practice itself is rejected, by the Baptists amongst modern Dissenters.[2]

Cf. Second Baptist Confession, Chap. 29:—

> "Baptism is an ordinance of the New Testament. . . . Those who do actually profess repentance towards God, faith in, and obedience to our Lord Jesus Christ, are the only proper subjects of this ordinance."

A little reflection shows that a false and Donatistic conception as to the nature of the Church underlies the Baptist doctrine and practice. In the view of that sect the Church is the sum of individual elect men and women, only to be increased by individual conversions, and made up, therefore, of really godly persons: the process of renewal of the souls of men which Christ intended should be carried on within His Church is thus left to exterior agencies. The Catholic doctrine, on the other hand, is that the Church of God is a great educational society, within which, by the due use of the various means of grace, God's gifts are to be fostered and developed; within which, being adopted as sons of God in Baptism, men come under all the holy influences of the Divine Family, and so grow up unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ.

The Continental Reformers, both of the Saxon and of the Swiss school, retained the practice of Infant Baptism:—

---

[1] See the passage quoted above from "Hermann's Consultatio," p. 213, note.

[2] The Quakers, since they reject the outward form of Baptism, of necessity also reject Infant Baptism.

Cf. The Chief Principles of the Christian Religion, as professed by the People called Quakers. 'Concerning Baptism,' § 12:—

> "As there is one Lord, and one faith, so there is one baptism. . . . And this baptism is a pure and spiritual thing, to wit the baptism of the Spirit and fire. . . . As to the baptism of infants, it is a mere human tradition, for which neither precept nor practice is to be found in all the Scripture."

Augsburg Confession, Part I. Art. IX. :

"De Baptismo docent . . . quod pueri sint baptizandi, qui per baptismum oblati Deo recipiantur in gratiam Dei.

"Damnant Anabaptistas, qui improbant baptismum puerorum, et affirmant pueros sine baptismo salvos fieri."

Tetrapolitan Confession, Art. XVII. :

"Infantibus quoque illud conferendum nostri docent, non minus quam sub Mose olim circumcidebantur."

Saxon Confession, Art. XIV. :

"Retinemus et infantium baptismum : quia certissimum est, promissionem gratiae etiam ad infantes pertinere, et ad eos tantum qui Ecclesiae inseruntur. Quia de his dictum est : Sinite parvulos ad me venire, quia talium est regnum coelorum. . . . Nec judicamus hunc morem tantum otiosam caerimoniam esse, sed vere tunc a Deo recipi et sanctificari infantes : quia tunc inseruntur Ecclesiae, et ad tales promissio pertinet."

Wurtemburg Confession, Art. X. :

"Agnoscimus Baptismum tam infantibus quam adultis in Ecclesia . . . ex institutione Christi dispensandum."

French Confession, Art. XXXV. :

"Praeterea quamvis Baptismus sit fidei et resipiscentiae sacramentum, tamen quum una cum parentibus posteritatem etiam illorum in Ecclesia Deus recenseat, affirmamus infantes sanctis parentibus natos, esse ex Christi auctoritate baptizandos."

Scotch Confession, Art. XXIII. :

"Baptismum pertinere, tam ad infantes fidelium quam ad ipsos fideles adultos et intellectu praeditos agnoscimus et confitemur, atque ita errorem Anabaptistarum damnamus, qui negant Baptismum infantibus usque dum cognitionem et fidem habuerint."

Belgic Confession, Art. XXXIV. :

"Anabaptistarum itaque errorem hic detestamur, qui non modo unico, et semel suscepto baptismo contenti non sunt : sed et baptismum infantium e fidelibus natorum damnant. Nos vero eos eadem ratione baptizandos, et signo foederis obsignandos esse credimus, qua olim in Israele parvuli circumcidebantur."

Second Helvetic Confession, Art. XX. :

"Damnamus Anabaptistas, qui negant baptizandos esse infantulos recens natos a fidelibus. Nam juxta doctrinam evangelicam, horum est regnum Dei, et sunt in foedere Dei, cur itaque non daretur eis signum foederis Dei ? Cur non per sanctum baptismum initiarentur, qui sunt peculium et in ecclesia Dei ?"

ARTICLE XXVIII

OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another: but rather it is a Sacrament of our Redemption by Christ's Death. Insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith receive the same, the Bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ, and likewise the Cup of Blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ.

Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of Bread and Wine) in the Supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by Holy Writ: but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions.

The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper only after an heavenly and spiritual manner: And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper, is Faith.

The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped.

DE CŒNA DOMINI.

Cœna Domini non est tantum signum mutuae benevolentiae Christianorum inter sese, verum potius est Sacramentum nostrae per mortem Christi redemptionis. Atque ideo rite, digne et cum fide sumentibus, panis quem frangimus est communicatio Corporis Christi: similiter poculum benedictionis, est communicatio Sanguinis Christi.

Panis et vini transubstantiatio in Eucharistia, ex sacris literis probari non potest, sed apertis Scripturae verbis adversatur, **Sacramenti naturam evertit**, et multarum superstitionum dedit occasionem.

Corpus Christi datur, accipitur, et manducatur in Cœna, tantum cœlesti et spirituali ratione. Medium autem quo Corpus Christi accipitur, et manducatur in Cœna, fides est.

Sacramentum Eucharistiae ex institutione Christi non servabatur, circumferebatur, elevabatur, nec adorabatur.

§ 1.—*SOURCE.*

This Article was composed by the English Reformers, and first appeared as the 29th of the XLII. Articles of 1553. At the Elizabethan Revision (1563) significant alterations were made.

(*a*) In the second paragraph the statement that Transubstantiation "**overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament**" was added.

(*b*) In 1553 the third paragraph of the Article ran thus:—

Forasmoche as the trueth of mannes nature requireth, that the bodie of one, and theself same manne cannot be at one time in diuerse places, but must nedes be in some one certeine place: Therefore the bodie of Christe cannot bee presente at one time in many, and diuerse places. And because (as holie Scripture doeth teache) Christe was taken vp into heauen, and there shall continue vnto thende of the worlde, a faithful man ought not, either to beleue, or openlie to confesse the reall, and bodilie presence (as thei terme it) of Christes fleshe and bloude, in the Sacramente of the Lordes supper.

Quum naturae humanae veritas requirat, ut unius ejusdemque hominis corpus in multis locis simul esse non posset, sed in uno aliquo et definito loco esse oporteat, idcirco Christi corpus, in multis et diversis locis, eodem tempore, praesens esse non potest. Et quoniam, ut tradunt Sacrae literae, Christus in Coelum fuit sublatus, et ibi usque ad finem seculi est permansurus, non debet quisquam fidelium carnis ejus et sanguinis Realem et Corporalem (ut loquuntur) praesentiam in Eucharistia vel credere vel profiteri.

The present paragraph beginning "**The Body of Christ is given**" was substituted for this in 1563.

While the theory of the Roman Church as to the manner of the Presence of Christ in the Eucharist was rejected as emphatically as ever, and an additional difficulty in the way of its acceptance stated, the new paragraph guards the truth from perversions of an opposite character. The paragraph of 1553 which it replaced must have suggested a view of the Sacrament in accord with that of Zwingli and his successors in the Swiss Reformation; it expressly excluded the presence of our Lord's humanity in any way whatever at the celebration of the Eucharist. The present wording of the Article declares, on the other hand, that the Body of Christ is **given** (by the minister), **taken, and eaten** (by the communicant); in other words, that there is a Real Objective Presence.[1]

We are able to show very clearly that in substituting the new paragraph it was intended to recognise the 'Real Presence.' The fact that the wording is due to Bishop Geste of Rochester

[1] See the Exposition of this part of the Article, given below.

has been established by the discovery among the State papers of a letter from Geste to Cecil (dated December 22, 1566), in which he expressly states "ye article was of myn own pennynge," and defends the use of the adverb "only" in the clause "The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper only after an heavenly and spiritual manner," saying that by it he did not intend to "exclude ye presence of Christis Body from the Sacrament, but only ye grossenes and sensiblenes in ye receavinge thereof"; adding besides, "I wold not for all that denye thereby any thing that I had spoken for ye presence."[1]

It is, moreover, abundantly clear that the change made in the wording of the Article in 1563 was most distasteful to those who sympathised with the views of the Swiss Reformers on the Eucharist. *Cf.*, *e.g.*, a letter written by Humphrey and Sampson to Bullinger (July 1566), in which are pointed out what the writers conceive to be the blemishes still remaining in the Church of England:—

> "Lastly, the Article composed in the time of Edward the Sixth respecting the spiritual eating, which expressly oppugned and took away the Real Presence in the Eucharist, and contained a most clear explanation of the truth, is now set forth among us mutilated and imperfect" (Zurich Letters, i. p. 165).

§ 2.—*OBJECT.*

The Article is divided into four clearly defined paragraphs, each having its own object:—

(*a*) The Sacrament is declared to be more than a bare sign.

(*b*) The Roman theory as to the manner of Christ's Presence in the Sacrament is repudiated.

(*c*) The opinion that there is no Real Presence of Christ in the Sacrament is repudiated.

(*d*) Certain practices common in pre-Reformation times are declared to be not traceable to Christ's institution.

§ 3. *EXPOSITION.*

NAMES GIVEN TO THE SACRAMENT.

(i.) *The Breaking of Bread.*

This is apparently the earliest designation of all; see Acts ii. 42 (ἦσαν δὲ προσκαρτεροῦντες . . . τῇ κλάσει τοῦ

[1] The text of the Bishop's letter is given in full in Appendix V.

ἄρτου, where the Peshitto Syriac Version renders by "Eucharist"), xx. 7 (ἐν δὲ τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων, συνηγμένων ἡμῶν κλάσαι ἄρτον:—Peshitto, "to break the Eucharist"). The name is derived, of course, from the action of breaking the Bread, which has from the first, in imitation of the Lord's own action (λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσας ΕΚΛΑCΕ, S. Luke xxii. 19; *cf.* parallels), formed part of the Eucharistic Celebration.

(ii.) *The Eucharist.*

S. Paul speaks of ἡ εὐχαριστία in 1 Cor. xiv. 16, and the same word is most likely also used with special reference to the Holy Eucharist in 1 Tim. ii. 1. *Cf.* the account of the Institution, "καὶ ΕΥΧΑΡΙCΤΗCΑC ἔκλασε, καὶ εἶπε," κ. τ. λ (1 Cor. xi. 24.; and see also S. Matt. xxvi. 27; S. Mark xiv. 23; S. Luke xxii. 19). This is the name most usual in the primitive Church; *e.g.*, see the "Didache," chap. ix., where the section dealing with the Sacrament is headed "περὶ δὲ τῆς εὐχαριστίας," and *cf.* Justin Martyr, Apol. i. c. 66, "καὶ ἡ τροφὴ αὕτη καλεῖται παρ' ἡμῖν εὐχαριστία."

It is a matter for much regret that the name "Eucharist," which, in addition to being Scriptural and primitive, so well expresses the character of the Sacrament as our "sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving," should to a great extent have fallen into disuse; a disuse traceable in the case of our own Church, no doubt, to the fact that the only titles directly given to the Sacrament in the Prayer Book are "The Lord's Supper" and "The Holy Communion," or "The Communion." For the use of the title "Eucharist" we have the sanction of this twenty-eighth Article, the Latin text of which has "Eucharistia" in two places where the English version gives "The Lord's Supper."

(iii.) *The Communion.*

S. Paul uses this word in connection with the Sacrament in 1 Cor. x. 16 (τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας ὃ εὐλογοῦμεν, οὐχὶ ΚΟΙΝΩΝΙΑ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐστι; τὸν ἄρτον ὃν κλῶμεν, οὐχὶ ΚΟΙΝΩΝΙΑ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐστιν;). The name properly denotes the act of participating, and in this sense only it was used with reference to the Sacrament in early times, but in post-

Reformation times it has been very largely used to designate the whole Office.

(iv.) *The Lord's Supper.*

1 Cor. xi. 20 is the only passage in the New Testament where the expression Κυριακὸν δεῖπνον occurs; it is there used of the Agape or Love-Feast, with which, at that early period, the celebration of the Holy Eucharist was joined. It can scarcely, however, be fairly claimed that Holy Scripture sanctions the appropriation of the title "Lord's Supper" to the Holy Eucharist, now that it has been separated from the Agape. As a title of the Eucharist the name dates from the Reformation period, since which time it has been in more or less common use by those separated from the Church of Rome. In some of the earlier symbolic writings of the sixteenth century 'Eucharist" is the title given to the Sacrament, as, *e.g.*, in Zwingli's "Fidei Ratio," and in the Tetrapolitan and First Helvetic Confessions; but it is at the same time spoken of as "sacrosancta Christi coena" (Tetrapolitan Confession, Cap. xviii.) and "coenam mysticam" (First Helvetic Confession, Art. XXIII.). "Lord's Supper" is the title adopted in the Augsburg Confession (Art. X.), and the great majority of subsequent formularies, both of the Saxon and Swiss schools, followed its lead[1]—Bohemian Confession (Art. XIII.), First Confession of Basle (Art. VI.), Calvin's Institutes (IV. xvii.), Confessio Variata Art. X.), Saxonica (Art. XV.), Czengerina, French Confession (Art. XXXVI.), Scotch (Art. XXI.), Belgic (Art. XXXV.), Second Helvetic (Art. XXI.), Catechesis Heidelbergensis (§§ lxxv.–lxxxii.), Consensus of Sandomir, and the Formula of Concord. Of the formularies issued during the course of the English Reformation, the earlier ones speak of "the Sacrament of the Altar" (X. Articles, Bishop's Book, and King's Book), while in the XIII. Articles the Sacrament is spoken of under the title of "The Eucharist." It is in the reign of Edward VI., when the teaching of the Continental Reformers began to have more influence upon the theology of our own Re-

[1] Of the later Continental formularies, the Wurtemburg Confession retains the title "Eucharist," adding in a parenthesis, "sic enim libuit majoribus nostris Coenam Dominicam vocare" (Art. XIX.).

formers, that we first meet with the title "Lord's Supper" in authoritative formularies of our Church (First and Second Prayer Books of Edward VI. and XLII. Articles).

(v.) *The Liturgy.*

The word λειτουργία has passed through the following stages of meaning:—

(*a*) In classical Greek it denoted a civil or political service performed by an individual, or by a few, for the good of the many.

(*b*) In the Septuagint it is regularly used, together with its cognate words, of the service of Priests and Levites in the Tabernacle or Temple (see, *e.g.*, Exod. xxviii. 31, 39; Num. iv. 12; 1 Chron. ix. 28, xvi. 4; and *cf.* in the New Testament, S. Luke i. 23; Heb. ix. 21).

(*c*) In the terminology of the Christian Church the word was used to denote any ministerial function, but soon became narrowed in meaning so as to refer especially to the Service of the Altar.

In this last sense ἡ λειτουργία, or the fuller ἡ θεία λειτουργία, is the usual name of the Eucharistic Office in the Eastern Church at the present day.

(vi.) *The Mass.*

This name for the Sacrament had been most widely used in the Western Church for many centuries previous to the Reformation.[1] Its origin is lost in obscurity, and many derivations have been suggested, the one now generally accepted being that which traces the origin of the term "Missa" to the words pronounced by the deacon at the dismissal of the catechumens, "Ite, missa est." The title has in itself no doctrinal significance, but since the Church of Rome has retained it to the practical exclusion of all other names of the Sacrament, it is not unnaturally associated in the popular mind with Roman doctrine.

We now proceed to consider the statements of the Article in detail.

(1.) The Sacrament is not a bare sign, but a partaking of the Body and Blood of Christ.

The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another,

[1] In the Prayer Book of 1549 the Communion Office was headed, "The Supper of the Lorde, and the Holy Communion, commonly called the Masse."

but rather it is a Sacrament of our Redemption by Christ's Death. Insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith receive the same, the Bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ and likewise the Cup of Blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ. (See 1 Cor. x. 16.)

Cf. the CHURCH CATECHISM:—

> "*Question.* What is the inward part, or thing signified?
> "*Answer.* The Body and Blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper."

See also the HOMILY FOR GOOD FRIDAY (1st Part):—

> "Yea, and we shall be hereby the more ready to receive our Saviour and Maker in his blessed Sacrament to our everlasting comfort and health of soul" (p. 445; ed. S.P.C.K.);

and the HOMILY OF THE WORTHY RECEIVING, &C., OF THE SACRAMENT:—

> "But thus much he must be sure to hold, that in the Supper of the Lord there is no vain ceremony, no bare sign, no untrue figure of a thing absent, but, as the Scripture saith, the table of the Lord, the bread and cup of the Lord, the memory of Christ, the annunciation of his death, yea the communion of the Body and Blood of the Lord in a marvellous incorporation, which by the operation of the Holy Ghost, the very bond of our conjunction with Christ, is through faith wrought in the souls of the faithful, whereby not only their souls live to eternal life, but they surely trust to win to their bodies a resurrection to immortality" (p. 476).

The contrast between the teaching of our Church and that of the Swiss Reformer Zwingli with regard to the nature of the Sacraments, and their place in the spiritual life of Christians, which we have already had occasion to note (see on Article XXV., p. 179), appears again markedly in the present Article, which plainly declares that the Sacrament is not merely a love-feast, but a means of grace. Contrast Zwingli's statement of the import of the Eucharist given in his book, "De vera et falsa religione":—

> "Est ergo sive eucharistia sive synaxis sive coena dominica nihil aliud, quam commemoratio, qua ii, qui se Christi morte et sanguine firmiter credunt patri reconciliatos esse, hanc vitalem mortem annunciant, hoc est laudant, gratulantur et praedicant. Jam ergo sequitur, quod qui ad hunc usum aut festivitatem con-

veniunt mortem domini commemoraturi, hoc est annunciaturi, sese unius corporis esse membra, sese unum panem esse ipso facto testentur" (Works, vol. iii. p. 263).

We should note that in this first paragraph of the Article the Sacrament is declared to be "a partaking of the Body and Blood of Christ to such as rightly (**rite**), worthily (**digne**), and with faith (**cum fide**) receive" it. Of the qualifying words here used, the first, **rite**, refers to the objective conditions, the due administration of the Sacrament "according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same" (see on Article XIX., p. 131, and Article XXV., p. 200).

Digne and **cum fide** refer to the subjective conditions. The meaning of these two qualifications, which are not to be considered as identical, is well illustrated by a reference to the Latin Version of the Exhortation in the Communion Office (1560):—

> "Nam sicut magnum beneficium est spiritualiter manducare corpus, et bibere sanguinem Christi, manere in Christo, et habere Christum in se habitantem, ac unum effici cum ipso; quod contigit illis qui digne accedunt, id est corde contrito et humiliato, cum vera fide ac fiducia certa misericordiae promissae per Christum; ita praesens periculum est, si indigne accedamus, quia efficimur rei corporis et sanguinis Domini, et ad judicium et condemnationem manducamus, quod non discernimus corpus Domini, nec ei debitum habemus honorem."

The qualifications referred to, therefore, seem to be:—

(*a*) Reverence for Christ's Body sacramentally present (**digne**).

(*b*) Faith in the promise attached to the Sacrament by God (**cum fide**).

That by **digne** we should understand "with reverence" also appears from Cranmer's use of the word:—

> "And here is to be diligently noted that we ought not *unreverently* and unadvisedly to approach unto the meat of the Lord's table, as we do to other common meats and drinks, but with great fear and dread lest we should come to the holy table *unworthily*, wherein is not only represented, but also spiritually given unto us very Christ Himself" (Works, vol. ii. p. 402).

(2.) TRANSUBSTANTIATION REPUDIATED.

The Corporal Presence of Christ in the Eucharist was asserted (circ. 830) by Paschasius Radbertus, a monk (and afterwards

abbot) of Corbey. A controversy followed, in which Radbertus was opposed by Bertram (Ratramnus), a monk belonging to the same monastery, as well as by some of the foremost scholars of the time, amongst them Rabanus Maurus (Archbishop of Mentz) and Johannes Scotus, and at a later period by Berengarius (Archdeacon of Angers).[1] In the succeeding centuries, however, the doctrine seems to have made way, as is indicated by the fact that Berengarius was condemned by a Council at Verceil in 1050, the writings of Johannes Scotus being also condemned at the same time. At the FOURTH LATERAN COUNCIL (1215) the doctrine of Transubstantiation was expressly decreed in the following terms:—

> "Una vero est fidelium universalis ecclesia, extra quam nullus omnino salvatur, in qua idem ipse sacerdos et sacrificium Jesus Christus, cujus corpus et sanguis in sacramento altaris sub speciebus panis et vini veraciter continentur, transubstantiatis pane in corpus et vino in sanguinem potestate divina, ut ad perficiendum mysterium unitatis, accipiamus ipsi de suo, quod accepit ipse de nostro" (Cap. 1).

Finally, the COUNCIL OF TRENT laid down (Session XIII., October 1551):—

> "Quoniam autem Christus redemptor noster corpus suum id, quod sub specie panis offerebat, vere esse dixit: ideo persuasum semper in Ecclesia Dei fuit, idque nunc denuo sancta haec Synodus declarat, per consecrationem panis et vini conversionem fieri totius substantiae panis in substantiam corporis Christi Domini nostri, et totius substantiae vini in substantiam sanguinis ejus, quae conversio convenienter et proprie a sancta Catholica Ecclesia Transsubstantiatio est appellata."

Cf. Canon II. of the same Session:—

> "Si quis dixerit, in sacrosancto Eucharistiae Sacramento remanere substantiam panis et vini una cum corpore et sanguine Domini nostri Jesu Christi, negaveritque mirabilem illam et singularem conversionem totius substantiae panis in corpus, et totius substantiae vini in sanguinem, manentibus duntaxat speciebus panis et vini, quam quidem conversionem Catholica Ecclesia aptissime Transsubstantiationem appellat; anathema sit."

The terminology connected with the theory of Transubstantiation is that of the scholastic philosophy of the Middle Ages, and

[1] Lanfranc, who was Archbishop of Canterbury from 1070 to 1089, took up the controversy against Berengarius.

philosophical opinions of the schoolmen underlie the doctrine. It is stated that, after the Consecration, the "substantia" of the Body and of the Blood of Christ altogether take the place of the "substantia" of the Bread and of the Wine respectively, although the "species" (*i.e.*, appearance) of bread and wine remain. The opinion that the "substance" of a thing is separable from its "accidents" (viz., appearance, touch, taste, smell, by which it is apprehended by our senses as existing in a certain place) necessarily underlies this theory, because, after Consecration, the "accidents" of bread and wine remain, whereas it is held by Romanists that the "substance" of the Elements is wholly changed. It is evident that the truth of the doctrine does not admit of demonstration, since we have no sense by which the "substance" of a thing may be apprehended apart from its "accidents"; it is, moreover, of course open to question whether the "substance" of anything can be said to exist at all apart from its "accidents."

Concerning this doctrine of Transubstantiation our Article declares [1]:—

(*a*) **Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of Bread and Wine) in the Supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by Holy Writ: but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture.**

Cf., *e.g.*, 1 Cor. xi. 26–28, where S. Paul speaks of the consecrated Elements as "this bread," "this cup."

(*b*) **It overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament.**[2]

For a Sacrament consists of two parts,[3] the outward part

[1] The same three objections to Transubstantiation are stated in the REFORMATIO LEGUM, "De Haeresibus," Cap. 19:—

"Peregrinum enim est, et alienum a sacris literis . . . et a conditione sacramentorum longe dissidens; postremo communis quaedam sentina superstitionum multarum in Ecclesiam Dei comportatarum."

[2] *Cf.* Calvin's INSTITUTES, IV. xvii. 14:—

"Evertitur ergo sacramenti natura, nisi in modo significandi terrenum signum rei coelesti respondeat. Ac proinde perit nobis mysterii hujus veritas, nisi verus panis verum Christi corpus repraesentet."

WURTEMBURG CONFESSION, Art. XIX.:—

"Necessitas ipsa veritatis sacramenti exigere videtur, ut cum vera praesentia corporis Christi verus panis maneat."

We have seen that several additions made at the Elizabethan revision (1563) are traceable to the Wurtemburg Confession; possibly, therefore, the clause, "overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament," which was inserted at that revision, may have been suggested by the passage quoted above from the same formulary.

[3] *Cf.* the CHURCH CATECHISM:—

"*Question.* How many parts are there in a Sacrament?

"*Answer.* Two; the outward visible sign, and the inward spiritual grace."

(*signum*), and the inward part (*res*); but according to the Transubstantiation theory, the *signum* is altogether changed into the *res*, and thus the Sacramental character of the rite is destroyed.

(*c*) It **hath given rise to many superstitions.**

E.g., the use of the reserved Sacrament as a charm, processions of the Sacrament, &c. (see notes on the last paragraph of the Article).

(3.) There is a real Objective Presence in the Eucharist. **The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper.**

The precise wording of this paragraph of the Article, when fairly considered, is only consistent with the doctrine of an Objective Presence. It is not said that the "sign" or "symbol" of the Body, but that the very Body of Christ Itself, is in the Sacrament—

(*a*) **given**, *i.e.*, by the Priest. It is the Body of Christ before the communicant receives it; the Presence of Christ's Body is objective.

(*b*) **taken**, by the communicant; and that which is taken must be external to him who takes it.

(*c*) **eaten**. See the quotations from the Homilies under heading (1) above, and note that it is not there said that in the Sacrament we receive 'symbols of Christ,'[1] but Christ Himself.

Very many passages might be quoted from the writings of the Fathers which testify to the belief of the Primitive Church in the Real Presence. Of these a few examples are here given:—

S. Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch (martyred A.D. 100–118),[2] ad Smyrn. vii., writes with reference to the Docetæ:

"Εὐχαριστίας καὶ προσευχῆς ἀπέχονται, διὰ τὸ μὴ ὁμολογεῖν· τὴν εὐχαριστίαν σάρκα εἶναι τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τὴν

[1] This is the teaching of Zwingli. See his "Expositio fidei Christianae," §§ 63–66:—

"Spiritualiter edere corpus Christi, nihil est aliud quam spiritu ac mente niti misericordia et bonitate dei per Christum . . . Verum cum ad coenam domini cum hac spirituali manducatione venis, et domino gratias agis pro tanto beneficio, pro animi tui liberatione, qua liberatus es a desperationis pernicie, et pro pignore, quo certus es de aeterna beatitudine, ac simul cum fratribus panem et vinum, quae jam symbolicum Christi corpus sunt, participas, jam proprie sacramentaliter edis, cum scilicet intus idem agis quod foris operaris, cum mens reficitur hac fide quam symbolis testaris."

[2] This is the date assigned by Lightfoot. Harnack gives the date as "soon after 130."

ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν παθοῦσαν, ἣν τῇ χρηστότητι ὁ πατὴρ ἤγειρεν."

Justin Martyr (martyred A.D. 165), Apol. i. 66:—

"Οὐ γὰρ ὡς κοινὸν ἄρτον οὐδὲ κοινὸν πόμα ταῦτα λαμβάνομεν· ἀλλ' ὃν τρόπον διὰ λόγου Θεοῦ σαρκοποιηθεὶς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν καὶ σάρκα καὶ αἷμα ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας ἡμῶν ἔσχεν, οὕτως καὶ τὴν δι' εὐχῆς λόγου τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ εὐχαριστηθεῖσαν τροφήν, ἐξ ἧς αἷμα καὶ σάρκες κατὰ μεταβολὴν τρέφονται ἡμῶν, ἐκείνου τοῦ σαρκοποιηθέντος Ἰησοῦ καὶ σάρκα καὶ αἷμα ἐδιδάχθημεν εἶναι."

Irenæus (circ. 180 A.D.), arguing against the Gnostics, thus writes (Adv. Haer., v. 2):—

"Ὅπότε οὖν καὶ τὸ κεκραμένον ποτήριον, καὶ ὁ γεγονὼς ἄρτος ἐπιδέχεται τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ γίνεται ἡ εὐχαριστία σῶμα Χριστοῦ, ἐκ τουτῶν δὲ αὔξει καὶ συνίσταται ἡ τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν ὑπόστασις· πῶς δεκτικὴν μὴ εἶναι λέγουσι τὴν σάρκα τῆς δωρεᾶς τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἥτις ἐστὶ ζωὴ αἰώνιος, τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ Κυρίου τρεφομένην, καὶ μέλος αὐτοῦ ὑπάρχουσαν."

S. Cyril of Jerusalem, "Lectures on the Mysteries" (delivered A.D. 386), iii. 3:—

"Ὥσπερ γὰρ ὁ ἄρτος τῆς εὐχαριστίας μετὰ τὴν ἐπίκλησιν τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος οὐκ ἔτι ἄρτος λιτός, ἀλλὰ σῶμα Χριστοῦ."

Cf. iv. 6:—"Μὴ πρόσεχε οὖν ὡς ψιλοῖς τῷ ἄρτῳ καὶ τῷ οἴνῳ· σῶμα γὰρ καὶ αἷμα Χριστοῦ κατὰ τὴν δεσποτικὴν τυγχάνει ἀπόφασιν· εἰ γὰρ καὶ ἡ αἴσθησίς σοι τοῦτο ὑποβάλλει, ἀλλὰ ἡ πίστις σε βεβαιούτω. μὴ ἀπὸ τῆς γεύσεως κρίνῃς τὸ πρᾶγμα, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τῆς πίστεως πληροφοροῦ ἀνενδοίαστως σώματος καὶ αἵματος Χριστοῦ καταξιωθείς."

Amongst the words of our own English Reformers, who so constantly professed to hold by the doctrines of the Primitive Church, we find statements as to the Real Presence in the Eucharist as strong as those just quoted; *e.g.*:—

Ridley says:

"In the Sacrament is a certain change, in that that bread, which was before common bread, is now made a lively presentation of Christ's Body, and not only a figure, but effectuously representeth His Body; that even as the mortal body was nourished by that visible bread, so is the internal soul fed with the heavenly food of Christ's Body, which the eyes of faith see, as the bodily eyes see only bread. Such a sacramental mutation I grant to be in the bread and wine, which truly is no small

change, but such a change as no mortal man can make, but only that omnipotency of Christ's Word" (Works, pp. 274, 275).

"We behold with the eyes of faith Him (the true Lord and Saviour of the world) present after grace, and spiritually set upon the table; and we worship Him which sitteth above, and is worshipped of the angels. For Christ is always assistant to His Mysteries, as the said Augustine saith" (*Ibid.*, p. 251).

LATIMER:

"And the same presence may be called the real presence (because to the faithful believer there is the real or spiritual body of Christ), which thing I here rehearse, lest some sycophant or scorner should suppose me with the Anabaptist to make nothing else of the Sacrament but a bare and naked sign" (Works, vol. ii. p. 252).

JEWEL:

"We affirm that bread and wine are holy and heavenly mysteries of the Body and Blood of Christ, and that by them Christ Himself, being the true bread of eternal life, is so presently given unto us [sic nobis praesentem exhiberi] as that by faith we verily receive His Body and His Blood" (Apol., Part ii. p. 32; ed. S.P.C.K.).

It is sometimes urged that by the Declaration on Kneeling (commonly called the "Black Rubric"), which is inserted in the Prayer Book after the Communion Office, the English Church is committed to a denial of the Real Presence. In considering the Declaration, however, the following points should be carefully borne in mind:—

(*a*) It was inserted in 1552 as an afterthought,[1] and *solely on the Royal authority*,[2] so that the Church was not in any way committed to it in its original form.

(*b*) At the Elizabethan revision (1559) the Declaration was altogether suppressed.

[1] The Prayer Book passed both Houses of Convocation on April 14, 1552, and it was decided that it should come into use on All Saints' Day following. On September 27, when three editions had been completed, the printing was suddenly stopped, on the ground that many printer's errors had crept in, and at the last moment (October 27) the Declaration was added.

[2] An entry in the Privy Council Register (October 27, 1552) orders—

"A letter to the Lord Chancellor to cause to be signed unto the Book of Common Prayer, lately set forth, a certain Declaration signed by the King's Majesty, and sent unto his Lordship, touching the kneeling at the receiving of the Communion" (Burnet's "Reformation," ed. Pocock, iii. 368, note 76).

(*c*) When reintroduced in 1661 a very significant change was made in the wording:—

1552.	1661.
"We dooe declare that it is not ment thereby, that any adoracion is doone, or oughte to bee doone, eyther unto the Sacramentall bread or wyne there bodily receyued, or unto anye *reall and essencial presence* there beeyng of Christ's naturall fleshe and bloude."	"It is hereby declared, That thereby no adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental Bread or Wine there bodily received, or unto any *Corporal Presence* of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood."

It thus appears that the Church would not have the "Black Rubric" in the Prayer Book until the words which might be taken for a denial of the truth of the Real Presence had been removed.

(*d*) Further, what is said in the Declaration with respect to "the natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ" being "in Heaven, and not here" is not inconsistent with Roman doctrine, and may be paralleled from the decrees of the COUNCIL OF TRENT. *Cf.* Session XIII. (October 1551):—

> "Neque enim haec inter se pugnant, ut ipse Salvator noster semper ad dexteram Patris *in coelis* assideat, *juxta modum existendi naturalem*, et ut multis nihilominus aliis in locis sacramentaliter praesens sua substantia nobis adsit, ea existendi ratione, quam etsi verbis exprimere vix possumus, possibilem tamen esse Deo, cogitatione per fidem illustrata assequi possumus et constantissime credere debemus."

(4) THE BODY OF CHRIST IS PRESENT AFTER AN HEAVENLY AND SPIRITUAL MANNER.

The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper only after an heavenly and spiritual manner.

While the doctrine of a *corporal* Presence, such as is implied in the theory of Transubstantiation, is excluded, the Church of England holds the doctrine of a *spiritual* and *real* Presence. The use of statements with regard to the *natural* Body and Blood of Christ when speaking of the Sacrament is rather misleading; for Christ present in His Sacrament is Christ Crucified and Risen, so that His Body is a *spiritual* Body (σῶμα πνευματικόν, 1 Cor. xv. 44), *i.e.*, a Body fully indwelt in and solely animated by πνεῦμα,

and hence, though material (S. Luke xxiv. 39), possessing powers and capabilities which do not belong to the *natural* body (S. John xx. 19). It should also be remembered that the Body of Christ, of which we speak, is the Body united everlastingly to the Deity of the Second Person in the Blessed Trinity (*cf.* Article II.), so that the capabilities of other bodies, whether *natural* or *spiritual*, can be no measure of the capabilities of the glorified Body of Him Who fills all things (Eph. iv. 10). We are not, therefore, called upon to choose between an obsolete scholastic philosophy (implied in the definitions of the Church of Rome)[1] and a merely figurative interpretation of our Lord's words (as given by Zwingli); but, in accordance with the teaching of the formularies of our Church, we hold a *real spiritual* Presence of the Body of Christ, acknowledging that to define further the manner of that Presence is beyond the reach of our knowledge.

We may here notice the doctrine expressed by the formularies of the Lutheran type. They emphatically assert the Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Sacrament:—

Augsburg Confession, Part I. Art. X.:

"De coena Domini docent, quod corpus et sanguis Christi vere adsint, et distribuantur vescentibus in coena Domini, et improbant secus docentes."

Saxon Confession, Art. XV.:

"Sed in usu instituto in hac communione vere et substantialiter adesse Christum, et vere exhiberi sumentibus corpus et sanguinem Christi."

---

[1] The doctrine of a *Real* though *Spiritual* Presence (as opposed to the conception involved in the doctrine of Transubstantiation) was held by some of those divines of the sixteenth century who were on the whole opposed to a doctrinal Reformation; *e.g.*:—

Cardinal Cajetanus (Papal Legate in Germany, before whom Luther was cited to appear in 1518) writes:

"Manducatur verum Corpus Christi in sacramento, sed non corporaliter, sed spiritualiter. Spiritualis manducatio, quae per animam fit, ad Christi carnem in sacramento existentem pertingit" (Opusc., Tom ii. Tract. 2; "De Euch.," Cap. v.).

Gardiner (Bishop of Winchester 1531–51; 1553–56, a great upholder of the Royal Supremacy, but otherwise an opponent of the Reformers), says:

"The Catholic teaching is, that the manner of Christ's presence in the Sacrament is spiritual and supernatural, not corporal nor carnal, not natural, not sensible, not perceptible, but only spiritual, the how and manner whereof God knoweth" (Quoted in Cranmer's Answer to Gardiner, Works, vol. iii. p. 241).

Wurtemburg Confession, Art. XIX. :

"De substantia Eucharistiae sentimus et docemus, quod verum corpus Christi et verus sanguis ejus in Eucharistia distribuatur, et refutamus eos qui dicunt panem et vinum Eucharistiae esse tantum absentis corporis et sanguinis Christi signa."

Formula of Concord :

"Credimus, quod in coena Domini corpus et sanguis Christi vere et substantialiter sint praesentia, et quod una cum pane et vino vere distribuantur atque sumantur. Credimus, verba testamenti Christi non aliter accipienda esse, quam sicut verba ipsa ad literam sonant, ita, ne panis absens Christi corpus et vinum absentem Christi sanguinem significent, sed ut propter sacramentalem unionem panis et vinum vere sint corpus et sanguis Christi" (p. 599).

"Docent, quemadmodum in Christo duae distinctae et non mutatae naturae inseparabiliter sunt unitae, ita in sacra coena duas diversas substantias, panem videlicet naturalem et verum naturale corpus Christi in instituta sacramenti administratione hic in terris simul esse praesentia" (p. 736).

With regard to the Eucharist, therefore, the Reformers of the Saxon school, though rejecting 'private masses,' were much more conservative than the Swiss Reformers. *Cf.* :—

Augsburg Confession, Part II. Art. III. :

"Falso accusantur ecclesiae nostrae, quod missam aboleant, retinetur enim missa apud nos, et summa reverentia celebratur. Servantur et usitatae ceremoniae fere omnes."

Saxon Confession, Art. XV. :

"In ipso autem ritu servamus morem usitatum universae Ecclesiae veteris, Latinae et Graecae."

Luther met Zwingli in conference at Marburg (1529), but could come to no agreement with him on Eucharistic doctrine, and always vehemently opposed the teaching of the Swiss Reformer on this point. He himself rejected scholastic dogmas on the subject, and in his reply to Henry VIII. of England spoke of Transubstantiation as "impious" and "blasphemous." He held strongly, however, to the Real Presence, while refusing to define the precise manner of that Presence. "Consubstantiation" is the name generally used to designate Luther's own theory, and the Lutheran doctrine as finally set forth in the Formula of Concord.

(5.) The means of reception is Faith.

The mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper, is Faith.

This clause of the Article refers to the subjective part of the Sacrament, the inward reception and eating by the individual. The means whereby this takes place is faith. It is not, of course, the case that the Sacrament derives its efficacy from our faith, or that faith produces the Presence of Christ within the heart; but He is present externally, and faith appropriates Him. During Christ's sojourn upon earth in the flesh, the power of the Lord was present to heal (S. Luke v. 17), but only those who had faith were able to appropriate the healing grace which flowed from His sacred Body. So now in the Eucharist we acknowledge a *real* Presence of Christ external to ourselves from which the Sacrament derives its efficacy, and we confess that this Presence is also *spiritual*, because the medium by which the external Presence affects us, and is with us, is not material contact but spiritual efficacy.

Calvin's doctrine of the Eucharist should be particularly noted. He rejected Transubstantiation,[1] and also objected to the Lutheran view as involving the *ubiquity*[2] of our Lord's risen Body;[3] but, on the other hand, he rose far above Zwingli's teaching as to the nature and use of the Sacrament, maintaining that while the Bread and Wine are symbols or representations[4] to which no

[1] "Mira enim astutia hic lusit Satan, ut mentes hominum e coelo abstractas, perverso errore imbueret, ac si panis elemento affixus esset Christus. Ac primo quidem praesentia Christi in sacramento minime talis somnianda nobis est qualem Romanae curiae artifices confinxerunt; ac si locali praesentia, corpus Christi manibus attrectandum, atterendum dentibus, ore deglutiendum sisteretur" (Institutes, IV. xvii. 12).

[2] Hence those in Switzerland who held Luther's view were called *Ubiquitarians*.

[3] "Alii . . . fatentur panem Coenae vere substantiam esse terreni et corruptibilis elementi, nec quicquam in se pati mutationis, sed sub se habere inclusum Christi corpus. . . . Sed quia in pane corpus ipsum locantes, ubiquitatem illi affingunt naturae suae contrariam, addendo autem Sub pane, illi occultum latere volunt: tales astutias e suis latebris paulisper extrahere necesse est" (Institutes, IV. xvii. 16).

[4] "Itaque sub pane et vino repraesentantur: quo discamus non modo nostra esse, sed nobis destinata in spiritualis vitae alimentum. Id est quod antea admonuimus, a rebus corporeis quae in sacramento proferuntur, quadam analogia nos ad spirituales deduci. Sic quum panis nobis in symbolum corporis Christi datur, haec statim concipienda est similitudo, Ut corporis nostri vitam panis alit. . . . Quum vinum in symbolum sanguinis propositum intuemur: cogitandum quos corpori usus vinum afferat (*Ibid.*, IV. xvii. 3).

Presence of Christ is attached, yet those who receive in faith[1] do really and truly partake of the Body and Blood of Christ,[2] which are thus in effect communicated to the faithful simultaneously with the Bread and Wine. It is usual to speak of this teaching as the doctrine of the *Virtual* Presence.

After the acceptance of the Consensus Tigurinus (1549), which embodied Calvin's doctrine on the Eucharist, that doctrine was generally adopted throughout Switzerland, and appears in the Confessions subsequently issued by, or under the influence of, Reformers of the Swiss school. *Cf., e.g.*:—

French Confession, Art. XXXVI.:

> "Quamvis enim nunc sit in coelis, ibidem etiam mansurus, donec veniat mundum judicaturus: credimus tamen eum arcana et incomprehensibili spiritus sui virtute per fidem apprehensa, nos nutrire et vivificare sui corporis et sanguinis substantia."

Scotch Confession, Art. XXI.:

> "Atque etiam quod in Coena Domini rite usurpata, Christus ita nobis conjungitur, quod sit ipsissimum animarum nostrarum nutrimentum et pabulum."

Belgic Confession, Art. XXXV.:

> "Ut autem panem hunc spiritualem et coelestem Christus nobis figuraret, sive repraesentaret; instituit Panem et Vinum terrenum et visibilem in Corporis et Sanguinis sui Sacramentum: ut iis nobis testificetur, quam vere accipimus et tenemus manibus nostris hoc Sacramentum, illudque ore comedimus (unde et postmodum vita haec nostra sustentatur), tam vere etiam nos fide (quae animae nostrae est instar et manus et oris) recipere verum corpus et verum sanguinem Christi, in animis nostris, ad vitam spiritualem in nobis fovendam."

---

[1] "Ego vero nego posse comedi absque fidei gustu: vel (si cum Augustino loqui magis placet) nego plus referre homines ex Sacramento quam vase fidei colligunt" (*Ibid.*, IV. xvii. 33).

[2] "Quicquid ad exprimendam veram substantialemque corporis ac sanguinis Domini communicationem, quae sub sacris Coenae symbolis fidelibus exhibetur, facere potest, libenter recipio: atque ita ut non imaginatione duntaxat aut mentis intelligentia percipere, sed ut re ipsa frui in alimentum vitae aeternae intelligantur" (*Ibid.*, IV. xvii. 19).

"Quod si humanitus excogitata symbola, quae imagines sunt rerum absentium potius quam notae praesentium, quas etiam ipsas fallaciter saepissime adumbrant, earum tamen titulis interdum ornantur: quae a Deo sunt instituta, multo majori ratione rerum nomina mutuantur, quarum et certam minimeque fallacem significationem semper gerunt, et adjunctam habent secum veritatem" (*Ibid.*, IV. xvii. 21).

Second Helvetic Confession, Art. XXI. :

"Ergo accipiunt fideles quod datur a ministro domini, et edunt panem domini, ac bibunt de poculo domini : intus interim opera Christi per spiritum sanctum percipiunt etiam carnem et sanguinem domini, et pascuntur his in vitam æternam."

Of the German Reformers, Melanchthon approximated to Calvinistic doctrine on the Eucharist. In the Confessio Variata (1540) he substituted for the wording of the Augsburg Confession ("quod Corpus et Sanguis Christi vere adsint, et distribuantur in coena") the following clause :—

"Quod cum pane et vino vere exhibeantur Corpus et Sanguis Christi."[1]

(6.) Certain practices common in mediæval times are declared to be not traceable to Christ's institution.

The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped.

A few words must be said concerning each of the practices here referred to :—

(i.) *Reservation.*

In pre-Reformation times the Reserved Host was sometimes worn round the neck,[2] held in the hand when undergoing the ordeal of fire,[3] or buried with the dead.[4] Such practices were not by the ordinance of Christ, Who instituted the Sacrament that it might be received. See the last paragraph of Article XXV., which states :—

"The Sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, or to be carried about : but that we should duly use them."

Cf. Council of Trent (Session XIII.) :—

"Fuerit a Christo Domino, ut sumatur, institutum" (Cap. v.).

There can scarcely, however, be any objection to Reservation of the Sacrament, when the express purpose of such

[1] This wording agrees with Calvin's manner of speaking ; *e.g.* :—

"Dico igitur, in Coenae mysterio per symbola panis et vini, Christum vere nobis exhiberi, adeoque corpus et sanguinem ejus" (Institutes, IV. xvii. 11).

[2] Thus Pope Benedict XIII., when he fled in disguise from Avignon, for his special protection bore upon his breast a little box containing the consecrated Element.

[3] *E.g.*, Fra Domenico, when going forth to the ordeal of fire on behalf of Savonarola, refused to enter the flames without bearing in his hand the consecrated Host. The incident will be familiar to readers of George Eliot's "Romola."

[4] This practice must have spread to some considerable extent, since we find it forbidden "to give the Eucharist to the bodies of the departed" by the Council of Carthage (397), and again by that of Auxerre (578).

Reservation is that those may receive who otherwise would be unable to do so. *E.g.*, it is often impossible, and at all times difficult, to secure a reverent celebration of the Holy Communion, or indeed any celebration at all, in the crowded dwellings of the poorest in our large cities, in cases of dangerous infectious diseases, or in critical cases of accidents. The communicating of such special cases with the Reserved Sacrament would be quite in accord with the practice of the Primitive Church.[1]

Cf. JUSTIN MARTYR, Apol. i. :—

"Εὐχαριστήσαντος δὲ τοῦ προεστῶτος καὶ ἐπευφημήσαντος παν τὸς τοῦ λαοῦ οἱ καλούμενοι παρ' ἡμῖν διάκονοι διδόασιν ἑκάστῳ τῶν παρόντων μεταλαβεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ εὐχαριστηθέντος ἄρτου καὶ οἴνου καὶ ὕδατος καὶ τοῖς οὐ παροῦσιν ἀποφέρουσι" (Cap. 65).

"Καὶ ἡ διάδοσις καὶ ἡ μετάληψις ἀπὸ τῶν εὐχαριστηθέντων ἑκάστῳ γίνεται καὶ τοῖς οὐ παροῦσι διὰ τῶν διακόνων πέμπεται" (Cap. 67).

In the Prayer Book of 1549 Reservation for the Communion of sick persons was allowed, though with certain restrictions :—

"And yf the same daye there be a celebracion of the holy cōmunion in the churche, then shall the priest reserue (at the open communion) so muche of the sacrament of the body and bloud, as shall serue the sicke person, and so many as shall communicate with hym (yf there be any). And so soone as he conueniently may, after the open communion ended in the church, shall goe and minister the same.

"And yf there be moe sicke persons to be visited the same day that the curate doth celebrate in any sicke mās house; then shall the curate (there) reserue so muche of the sacramente of the body and bloud: as shall serue the other sicke persons, and such as be appoynted to communicate with them (yf there be any). And shall immediately cary it, and minister it unto them."

In the second Prayer Book (1552) permission to reserve the Sacrament was withdrawn; but in the Latin Prayer Book authorised by Queen Elizabeth (1560) Reservation for the sick was again permitted.[2]

[1] In the Eastern Church at the present day, as in primitive times, the Sacrament is reserved for the purpose of Communion only.

[2] Calvin altogether opposed Reservation, even for the purpose of communicating the sick. *Cf.* INSTITUTES, IV. xvii. 39 :—

"Quorsum igitur evadet altera (scil. consecratio), cujus vis ad aegrotos usque non pervenit? Sed enim qui sic faciunt, habent veteris Ecclesiae exemplum. Fateor, verum in re tanta, et in qua non sine magno periculo erratur, nihil tutius est quam ipsam veritatem sequi."

The rubric which now stands at the end of the Communion Service directing that the Consecrated Elements shall be reverently consumed immediately after the Blessing has historically no connection with Reservation. It was inserted at the revision of 1661, a century after the practice of Reservation had ceased in the English Church, and its purpose was to guard against any profane use of the Consecrated Elements.

(ii.) Closely connected with the Reservation of the Blessed Sacrament are the *Carrying about* and *Worshipping* of the Consecrated Elements.

In East and West alike, in primitive times, the Sacrament was reserved for purposes of Communion only; but in the Middle Ages we find a development in the Western Church, the Reserved Host being treated as an object of worship. The events of Holy Week were dramatised, the Host being carried in possession on Palm Sunday, placed in a sepulchre on Good Friday, and carried in the procession on Easter Day. After the institution of the Feast of Corpus Christi (in the thirteenth century) a procession of the Host soon became the characteristic observance of the Festival.[1] At first the Host was always veiled when thus carried, but by degrees the custom obtained of placing It in a vessel of glass or crystal fitted into a case of precious metal (called the Monstrance), and it was thus exposed to the veneration of the faithful.[2] Thus in pre-Reformation times men professed great reverence for the Blessed Sacrament by worshipping, whether at a celebration, or when the Host was carried in procession, and yet at the same time neglected the very end of the Institution of the Sacrament—its constant reception by all the faithful—so that it had come about that the people communicated very rarely. At the Reformation a reaction set in. Our Reformers, seeing that the purpose for which Christ instituted

[1] M. Thiers has shown ("Traité de l'Exposition du S. Sacrament") that the origin of the procession is not to be traced to this Festival, because instances of the procession are on record before the Festival was instituted.

[2] The exposition of the Sacrament at other times than the Festival of Corpus Christi dates from the seventeenth century; and in the present day, with some form of service, it is a matter of very frequent occurrence in the Roman Church. Such service concludes with the Blessing pronounced by the priest, who makes the sign of the Cross over the people with the Monstrance; hence the rite has gained the name of "Benediction."

the Sacrament had been obscured, emphasised the Communion aspect of the Eucharist, and drew attention to the fact that the worshipping of the Sacrament, which had for so long held a prominent place in the devotions of the Western Church, was not "by Christ's ordinance."

While the Reformers thus found it necessary for those times to protest against the worshipping of the Sacrament, which had taken the place of frequent participation, they had no intention of refusing worship to Christ present in His Sacrament. *E.g.*, RIDLEY says:—

> "We worship, I confess, the same true Lord and Saviour of the world . . . we behold with the eyes of faith Him present after grace, and spiritually set upon the table; and we worship Him which sitteth above, and is worshipped of the angels" (Works, p. 251).

Christ present in the Sacrament is to be worshipped, for, as God (and the Manhood has been "taken into God"), worship is due to Him, under whatever conditions He manifests Himself. The worship is not directed to the outward sign, the substance of Bread and Wine; it is obvious that no adoration ought to be done unto the Sacramental Bread and Wine bodily received (Black Rubric).

(iii.) *Elevation.*

The Elevation referred to in the Article is the lifting up of the Consecrated Elements for the adoration of the people, a practice usual in the West in pre-Reformation times, though not formally authorised before the thirteenth century, and now occupying a prominent place in the celebration of Mass in the Church of Rome.

Such Elevation was expressly forbidden in the Prayer Book of 1549, by a rubric inserted immediately after the Consecration:—

> "These wordes before rehersed are to be saied, turning still to the Altar, without any eleuacion, or shewing the Sacrament to the people."

This prohibition was, however, removed in 1552, and has not since been revived.

The statement of the Article should not be taken as covering the Elevation of the Sacrament in presenting the Sacrifice to the Father, a ritual action almost universal in

early times,[1] and traced, in primitive Liturgies, to the action of our Lord Himself at the Institution of the Sacrament. *Cf.*, *e.g.*, the Greek Liturgy of S. James :—

"Ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ᾗ παρεδίδοτο, μᾶλλον δὲ ἑαυτὸν παρεδίδου, ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς καὶ σωτηρίας

[εἶτα ὁ ἱερεὺς τῇ χειρὶ τὸν ἄρτον κατασχὼν λέγει]

λαβὼν τὸν ἄρτον ἐπὶ τῶν ἁγίων καὶ ἀχράντων καὶ ἀμώμων καὶ ἀθανάτων αὐτοῦ χειρῶν, ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν καὶ ἀναδείξας σοὶ τῷ Θεῷ καὶ Πατρί, εὐχαριστήσας, ἁγιάσας, κλάσας, ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν τοῖς αὐτοῦ μαθηταῖς καὶ ἀποστόλοις, εἰπών" κ.τ.λ.

The Elevation of the Sacrament (corresponding to the typical heaving and waving of the Peace Offering) was thus in primitive times a representation on earth of the continual showing forth of Christ's Sacrifice before the Father in heaven (*cf.* 1 Cor. xi. 26), and was avowedly "by Christ's ordinance," for the elevation, no less than the blessing and the breaking, of the Bread was stated to be done in imitation of His own action.

The connection in which the words "**lifted up**" stand in the Article justifies us in limiting their application to the "shewing to the people," for there is in the present Article no question as to the Eucharistic Sacrifice; but the paragraph in which the words occur is concerned with those devotions to the Sacrament which had so largely taken the place of Communion, and had thus obscured the great end of its institution.

The great moderation of the wording of this last paragraph of the Article is very noticeable. It is not asserted that the practices referred to are contrary to Christ's ordinance, but simply affirmed that such uses do not come within the scope of what has been Divinely ordained. In dealing with the same subjects the Continental Confessions speak much more strongly. *Cf.*, *e.g.* :—

Saxon Confession, Art. XV.:

"Est et manifesta profanatio, partem coenae Domini circumgestare et adorare."

Wurtemburg Confession, Art. XIX.:

"Alius error est, quod una pars Eucharistiae soleat in singu-

[1] It is found in the Liturgies of S. James, S. Basil, S. Chrysostom, the Armenian and Coptic Liturgies, and others. It occurs in the modern Roman Service, as well as the Elevation for the adoration of the congregation.

larem cultum Dei circumgestari et reponi. Vetat autem Spiritus Sanctus ne cultus Dei, sine certo Dei mandato, instituatur."

See also Scotch Confession, Art. XXII.:

"Adoratio, veneratio, circumgestatio per plateas urbium, conservatio panis in pixide, vel capsula, non sunt legitimus usus Sacramenti corporis Christi, sed mera ejusdem profanatio."

Westminster Confession, XXIX. 4:

"Worshipping the elements, the lifting them up, or carrying them about for adoration, and the reserving them for any pretended religious use; are all contrary to the nature of this sacrament, and to the institution of Christ."

ARTICLE XXIX

OF THE WICKED WHICH DO NOT EAT THE BODY OF CHRIST IN THE USE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

The wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth (as Saint Augustine saith) the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ: yet in nowise are they partakers of Christ, but rather to their condemnation do eat and drink the sign or Sacrament of so great a thing.

DE MANDUCATIONE CORPORIS CHRISTI, ET IMPIOS ILLUD NON MANDUCARE.

Impii et fide vera destituti, licet carnaliter, et visibiliter (ut Augustinus loquitur) Corporis et Sanguinis Christi Sacramentum, dentibus premant, nullo tamen modo Christi participes efficiuntur. Sed potius tantae rei Sacramentum, seu Symbolum, ad judicium sibi manducant et bibunt.

§ 1.—*SOURCE.*

This Article first appeared in the draft presented to Convocation in 1562. It was, however, struck out from the Articles as sanctioned by the Queen, and was not published until 1571, when it was reinserted by the Bishops.

The scruples of Cecil, or of the Queen, who both inclined to pre-Reformation doctrine on the Eucharist, may account for the withdrawal of this Article from the Convocation records in 1562; or perhaps its suppression should be traced to a desire to deal tenderly with those who held Roman doctrine, and who were still at this time in communion with the Church of England.

In 1571, however, the secession of the Romanist party in England was taking place,[1] so that there was no need for the continued exercise of such forbearance. This circumstance would account for the readmission of the Article at that date.

A further ground for hesitation in promulgating the Article may have been the doubt raised as to the authenticity of the

[1] For the first eleven years of Elizabeth's reign the Roman party made their Communions and celebrated in English churches according to the Prayer Book. The final Bull of excommunication was not issued from Rome until 1570.

words quoted and attributed to S. Augustine.[1] The fairness of the quotation was, we know, called in question by Cecil during an interview with Archbishop Parker, which took place in 1571.[2]

§ 2.—*OBJECT.*

To guard against merely mechanical views of the Sacrament, and to provide a safeguard by reminding us how alone we may receive the Sacrament beneficially. We may compare the Article with the words of the Exhortation in the Communion Office:—

> "For as the benefit is great, if with a true penitent heart and lively faith we receive that holy Sacrament . . . so is the danger great, if we receive the same unworthily. For then we are guilty of the Body and Blood of Christ our Saviour; we eat and drink our own damnation, not considering the Lord's Body."

§ 3.—*EXPOSITION.*

It is clear, of course, that there can be no beneficial reception by those who are in a state of sin; the Sacrament cannot act as a sort of charm in the case of such as come without faith and unprepared. On the other hand, we have seen that Christ is present objectively in the Sacrament, His Presence not depending upon the mental emotion or spiritual condition of the recipient.

Now we are not here involved in any contradiction. We distinguish in the Holy Eucharist three parts—the *Signum*, the *Res*, and the *Virtus Sacramenti*.[3] Of these the *Signum*, viz., Bread and Wine, is evidently received by all communicants. The *Res*,

[1] The passage in question occurs in the twenty-sixth Treatise on S. John. It was rejected by the Benedictine editors of S. Augustine as not being genuine, but the words occur in Alcuin, Bede, and others.

[2] An account of the occurrence is given in Strype's "Parker," pp. 331, 332.

[3] For this threefold division we have the sanction of the Church Catechism. It can scarcely escape the notice of an attentive reader that there is a marked difference between the account of Baptism and that of the Holy Eucharist there given. In the instruction on the Sacrament of Baptism two heads are given:—

> "What is the outward visible sign or form in Baptism?"
> "What is the inward and spiritual grace?"

while in the account given of the Eucharist the teaching of the Catechism is arranged under three heads:—

> "What is the outward part or sign (*Signum*) of the Lord's Supper?"
> "What is the inward part, or thing signified (*Res*)?"
> "What are the benefits whereof we are partakers thereby (*Virtus Sacramenti*)?"

the Body and Blood of Christ, is really there, and is offered to all.[1] But while the reality of the Sacrament is not dependent upon faith,[2] our own individual ability to partake of Christ is thus dependent. Christ's Presence is only realised by the faithful; only they receive the *Virtus* of the Sacrament; only they "*so eat* the Flesh of Christ and drink His Blood"[3] that He evermore dwells in them, and they in Him.

The wicked, as our Article says, **are in no wise partakers of Christ**; on the contrary, by their wilfulness and misuse of His most holy Ordinance, they incur condemnation. (See the passages of Scripture quoted below.)

It is to be noted that, since It neither derives virtue nor efficacy from the worthiness of the receivers, nor suffers any loss or diminution of Its power and perfectness by reason of their unworthiness, therefore the Sacrament *always takes effect;* but not always the same effect. To some it is the savour of life, unto life; to others, of death, unto death:—

> "In such only as worthily receive the Sacraments, they have a wholesome effect or operation: but they that receive them unworthily, purchase to themselves damnation" (Article XXV.).

---

[1] *Cf.* Cranmer, Works, iii. p. 146:—

> "As of some the Scripture saith, that their riches is their redemption, and to some it is their damnation; and as God's word to some is life, to some it is death and a snare, as the prophet saith; and Christ Himself to some is a stone to stumble at, to some is a raising from death; not by conversion of substances (*i.e.*, it is one and the same word and one and the same Christ, whatever the effect may be), but by good or evil use, that thing which to the godly is salvation, to the ungodly is damnation: so is the water in Baptism, and the Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper, to the worthy receivers Christ Himself and eternal life, and to the unworthy receivers everlasting death and damnation: not by conversion of one substance into another (the Sacraments are the same in both cases), but by godly or ungodly use thereof."

[2] *Cf.* Second Helvetic Confession, Art. XIX.:—

> "Interim sicut a dignitate, vel indignitate ministrorum, non aestimamus integritatem sacramentorum, itaque *neque a conditione sumentium.* Agnoscimus enim sacramentorum integritatem ex fide vel veritate meraque bonitate Dei dependere. Sicut enim Verbum Dei manet verum Verbum Dei, quo non tantum verba nuda recitantur, dum praedicatur, sed simul a Deo offeruntur res verbis significatae, vel annunciatae, tametsi impii vel increduli verba audiant, et intelligant, rebus tamen significatis non perfruantur; eo quod vera fide non recipiant: Ita sacramenta verbo, signis, et rebus significatis, constantia, manent vera et integra Sacramenta, *non tantum significantia res sacras, sed Deo offerente etiam res significatas,* tametsi increduli res oblatas non percipiant. Fit hoc non dantis aut offerentis Dei vitio, sed hominum sine fide illegitimeque accipientium culpa; quorum incredulitas fidem Dei irritam non facit."

[3] Prayer of Humble Access in Communion Office.

Our exposition is in accordance with Scripture teaching on the subject; see, *e.g.*:—

(*a*) 1 Cor. xi. 27: *ὥστε ὃς ἂν ἐσθίῃ τὸν ἄρτον, ἢ πίνῃ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦ Κυρίου ἀναξίως, ἔνοχος ἔσται τοῦ σώματος καὶ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Κυρίου.*

A person who received unworthily could not be said to be guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord if the Elements, after consecration, were mere ordinary bread and wine.

(*b*) 1 Cor. xi. 29: *ὁ γὰρ ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων κρῖμα ἑαυτῷ ἐσθίει καὶ πίνει, μὴ διακρίνων τὸ σῶμα.*

But there would be no blame in not discriminating the Lord's Body, unless that Body were present there.

ARTICLE XXX

OF BOTH KINDS.

The Cup of the Lord is not to be denied to the lay people. For both the parts of the Lord's Sacrament, by Christ's ordinance and commandment, ought to be ministered to all Christian men alike.

DE UTRAQUE SPECIE.

Calix Domini laicis non est denegandus: utraque enim pars Dominici Sacramenti ex Christi institutione et praecepto, omnibus Christianis ex aequo administrari debet.

§ 1.—*SOURCE.*

Composed by the English Reformers, and first inserted at the Elizabethan revision (1563).

§ 2.—*OBJECT.*

To restore to the laity participation in the Chalice, which, by a strange abuse, had been taken from them in the Western Church.[1]

We may trace the withdrawal of the Cup from the laity to the operation of two causes:—

(*a*) The danger of irreverence suggested this course as a means for securing the Chalice from profanation. Even in the eleventh century, when Communion in both kinds was still the rule of the Church, the consecrated Wine was sometimes administered through a tube as a precaution against spilling any portion of It.

(*b*) The growth of the belief in Transubstantiation also contributed to the discontinuance of the administration of the Sacrament in both kinds, for it was held that our Blessed Lord was so entirely and indivisibly present in either Element that all who were partakers of the consecrated Host

[1] In the Eastern Church both Elements are given to the communicants together in a spoon, the consecrated Bread being first dipped in the Chalice.

received therein His Body and His Blood. This is called the doctrine of "*Concomitance.*" [1]

The COUNCIL OF CONSTANCE (Session XIII., June 15, 1415) enforced Communion in one kind, justifying it both as a safeguard against dangers, and also from the doctrine of Concomitance. The decree of the Council on the subject runs as follows:—

> "Et sicut haec consuetudo ad evitandum aliqua pericula et scandala est rationabiliter introducta, quod licet in primitiva ecclesia hujusmodi sacramentum reciperetur a fidelibus sub utraque specie, postea a conficientibus utraque, et a laicis tantummodo sub specie panis suscipiatur: cum firmissime credendum sit, et nullatenus dubitandum, integrum Christi corpus et sanguinem tam sub specie panis, quam sub specie vini veraciter contineri. Unde cum hujusmodi consuetudo ab ecclesia et sanctis patribus rationabiliter introducta, et diutissime observata sit, habenda est pro lege, quam non licet reprobare, aut sine ecclesiae auctoritate pro libito mutare."

Further, the penalty of excommunication is threatened:—

> "Item ipsa sancta Synodus decernit et declarat super ista materia, reverendissimis in Christo patribus, et dominis patriarchis, primatibus, archiepiscopis, episcopis, et eorum in spiritualibus vicariis ubilibet constitutis, processus esse dirigendos, in quibus eis committatur et mandetur auctoritate hujus sacri Concilii sub poena excommunicationis, ut effectualiter puniant eos contra hoc decretum excedentes, qui communicando populum sub utraque specie panis et vini exhortati fuerint, et sic faciendum esse docuerint."

At the outset of the Reformation in Germany, Luther protested against the withdrawal of the Cup from the laity,[2] and the AUGSBURG CONFESSION reformed the abuse. See Part II. Art. I.:—

> "Laicis datur utraque species sacramenti in coena Domini, quia hic mos habet mandatum Domini (Matt. xxvi.) Bibite ex hoc omnes. Ubi manifeste praecepit Christus de poculo, ut omnes

---

[1] The doctrine appeared as early as the time of S. Anselm, who stated "in utraque specie totum Christum sumi" (Epistles, Lib. iv. ep. 117).

[2] In his famous "Prelude on the Babylonish Captivity of the Church" (1520), Luther characterised departure from primitive rule in this matter as impiety.

bibant, et ne quis possit cavillari, quod hoc ad sacerdotes tantum pertineat, Paulus ad Corinth. exemplum recitat, in quo apparet totam ecclesiam utraque specie usam esse."

In the reign of Henry VIII. the English Church was not prepared to go so far in a reforming direction as to alter the prevailing custom in this matter, and when the German reforming party (whose deputies had been in conference, in 1538, with representative English divines)[1] freely censured the withdrawal of the Cup from the laity as an abuse, England replied with the Six Article Law, the second Article of which expressly declared that Communion in both kinds is not necessary for all.

Stat. 1 Ed. VI. c. 1, however, in conformity with a unanimous decree of Convocation, legalised Communion in both kinds, which was also provided for in the two Prayer Books of 1549 and 1552.

With our Article we may compare the tenth of the XI. Articles of 1559, which affirms:—

> "I am of that mind also, that the holy Communion or Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, for the due obedience to Christ's institution, and to express the virtue of the same, ought to be ministered unto the people under both kinds: and that it is avouched by certain fathers of the Church to be a plain sacrilege, to rob them of the mystical cup for whom Christ hath shed his most precious Blood, seeing he himself hath said, Drink ye all of this; considering also, that in the time of the ancient doctors of the Church, as Cyprian, Hierom, Augustine, Gelasius, and others, six hundred years after Christ and more, both the parts of the Sacrament were ministered to the people."

When the Council of Trent reassembled in 1562, under Pope Pius IV., both the Emperor Ferdinand and the Cardinal of Lorraine, with other representatives from France, urged the desirability of yielding Communion in both kinds. In the result, however, Decrees and Canons were agreed upon confirming the mediæval practice (Session XXI.):—

> "Itaque sancta ipsa Synodus, a Spiritu sancto, qui spiritus est sapientiae et intellectus, spiritus consilii et pietatis, edocta, atque ipsius Ecclesiae judicium et consuetudinem secuta, declarat ac

[1] See pp. 6, 7.

docet, nullo divino praecepto Laicos et Clericos non conficientes obligari ad Eucharistiae Sacramentum sub utraque specie sumendum; neque ullo pacto salva fide dubitari posse, quin illis alterius speciei communio ad salutem sufficiat."

Canon I.—Si quis dixerit, ex Dei praecepto, vel necessitate salutis, omnes et singulos Christi fideles utramque speciem sanctissimi Eucharistiae Sacramenti sumere debere; anathema sit.

Canon II.—Si quis dixerit, sanctam Ecclesiam Catholicam non justis causis et rationibus adductam fuisse, ut Laicos atque etiam Clericos non conficientes sub panis tantummodo specie communicaret, aut in eo errasse; anathema sit.

Canon III.—Si quis negaverit, totum et integrum Christum omnium gratiarum fontem et auctorem sub una panis specie sumi, quia, ut quidam falso asserunt, non secundum ipsius Christi institutionem sub utraque specie sumatur; anathema sit.

To the decrees on Reformation passed at the twenty-second Session of the Council was appended a further decree referring to the Pope the question of yielding the chalice to the laity:—

"Insuper, quum eadem sacrosancta synodus superiori sessione duos articulos alias propositos, et tum nondum discussos, videlicet: an rationes, quibus sancta catholica ecclesia adducta fuit, ut communicaret laicos atque etiam non celebrantes sacerdotes sub una panis specie, ita sint retinendae, ut nulla ratione calicis usus cuiquam sit permittendus; et: an, si honestis et Christianae caritati consentaneis rationibus concedendus alicui vel nationi vel regno calicis usus videatur, sub aliquibus conditionibus concedendus sit, et quaenam illae sint, in aliud tempus, oblata sibi occasione, examinandos atque definiendos reservaverit; nunc, eorum, pro quibus petitur, saluti optime consultum volens, decrevit, integrum negotium ad sanctissimum dominum nostrum esse referendum, prout praesenti decreto refert, qui pro sua singulari prudentia id efficiat, quod utile reipublicae Christianae, et salutare petentibus usum calicis fore judicaverit."

§ 3.—*EXPOSITION.*

By Christ's command and ordinance both kinds should be administered to all. His words at the Institution of the Sacrament, with reference to the Cup, were, Πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες (S. Matt. xxvi. 27); and S. Mark (xiv. 23) adds, καὶ ἔπιον ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες. *Cf.* also S. Paul's testimony in 1 Cor. x. 21, xi. 26, *et seqq.*

Two considerations which are sometimes brought forward as justifying Communion in one kind may be briefly noticed:—

(*a*) It has been urged that it was to priests our Lord said the words, "Drink ye all."

But this argument scarcely applies, since the Roman Church withholds the Cup from all present at the celebration of the Eucharist, whether priests or laymen, except only the consecrating priest.

(*b*) There is the argument from the doctrine of "Concomitance," viz., that in the one Species we receive both the Body and the Blood of the Lord, for in the Body we have the Blood.

But the Blood of Christ of which we partake in the Eucharist is emphatically stated by our Lord to be His Blood as *shed* in Sacrifice for us, and not (with all reverence be it said) His Blood as circulating in the Body:—

> "This is my Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sins" (Prayer of Consecration).

Cf. the words of administration:—

> "The Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was shed for thee." . . .

We do not, of course, assert that those who communicate in one kind only lose the grace of the Sacrament which is necessary to salvation; at the same time the withdrawal of the Cup from the laity is a grievous mutilation of Christ's ordinance.

ARTICLE XXXI

OF THE ONE OBLATION OF CHRIST FINISHED UPON THE CROSS.

The Offering of Christ once made is the perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual, and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said, that the Priests did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits.

DE UNICA CHRISTI OBLATIONE IN CRUCE PERFECTA.

Oblatio Christi semel facta, perfecta est redemptio, propitiatio et satisfactio pro omnibus peccatis totius mundi, tam originalibus quam actualibus. Neque praeter illam unicam est ulla alia pro peccatis expiatio. Unde Missarum sacrificia, quibus vulgo dicebatur, sacerdotem offerre Christum in remissionem poenae aut culpae pro vivis et defunctis, blasphema figmenta sunt, et perniciosae imposturae.

§ 1.—*SOURCE.*

This Article was composed by the English Reformers, and first appeared as the thirtieth of the XLII. Articles of 1553. It is parallel to Article III. Part II. of the AUGSBURG CONFESSION, but there is not such close verbal agreement between the two as to warrant the conclusion that our Article was directly based upon the very much longer statement of the Lutheran formulary. Like our Article, the Augsburg Confession refers to the popular theory which led to the excessive multiplication of Masses:—

> "Accessit opinio, quae auxit privatas missas in infinitum, videlicet quod Christus sua passione satisfecerit pro peccato originis, et instituerit missam, in qua fieret oblatio pro quotidianis delictis, mortalibus et venialibus. Hinc manavit publica opinio, quod missa sit opus delens peccata vivorum et mortuorum ex opere operato. Hic coeptum est disputari, utrum una missa dicta pro pluribus, tantundem valeat, quantum singulae pro singulis. Haec disputatio peperit istam infinitam multitudinem missarum."

In this connection the same Confession also emphasises the unique character of the Sacrifice of Christ:—

> "De his opinionibus nostri admonuerunt, quod dissentiant a Scripturis sanctis, et laedant gloriam passionis Christi. Nam passio Christi fuit oblatio et satisfactio, non solum pro culpa originis, sed etiam pro omnibus reliquis peccatis." . . .

We may also compare the ninth of the XI. ARTICLES of 1559:—

> "The doctrine that maintaineth the mass to be a propitiatory sacrifice for the quick and dead, and a mean to deliver souls out of purgatory, is neither agreeable to Christ's ordinance, nor grounded upon doctrine Apostolic, but contrariwise most ungodly and most injurious to the precious redemption of our Saviour Christ, and his only sufficient Sacrifice offered once for ever upon the altar of the Cross."

The word "blasphema" was inserted in the Article in 1563.

§ 2.—*OBJECT.*

To set forth the unique character and the completeness of the Sacrifice which Christ offered on the Cross, and to oppose the idea current in the times immediately preceding the Reformation with regard to the repetition of that Offering in the "Sacrifices of Masses."

§ 3.—*EXPOSITION.*

(1.) THE SACRIFICE OF CHRIST, ONCE OFFERED, IS THE ONLY SACRIFICE FOR SIN.

The Offering of Christ once made is the perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual, and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone. (See Heb. ix. 25, 26; x. 10, 26.)

The doctrine of the Atonement has been already treated in Articles II. and XV. (where see notes). The point specially emphasised in the present Article is the unique character and the completeness of the Sacrifice of Christ, a truth which had been obscured by the pre-Reformation system with regard to the offering of Masses. (See the quotations from the Augsburg Confession, Part II. Art. III., given in § 1 above.)

It is significant that in each place where the Offering of Christ is touched upon in the Articles the sufficiency of His Sacrifice as an Atonement for *all* sin is especially dwelt upon :—

Article II. :

"To be a Sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for all actual sins of men."

Article XV. :

"He came to be the Lamb without spot, who by sacrifice of himself once made, should take away the sins of the world."

If the words of this thirty-first Article are carefully compared with the (more or less) parallel passage in the Augsburg Confession, the very emphatic manner in which this truth was stated by our English Reformers comes out in strong relief :—

Augsburg Confession :

"Passio Christi fuit oblatio et satisfactio, non solum pro culpa originis, sed etiam pro omnibus reliquis peccatis."

Our Article contains the additional words, "*perfecta*" . . . "*totius mundi.*" Similar phraseology also appears in the Consecration Prayer as arranged in 1552 :—

"Who made there, by his one Oblation of himself once offered, a full, *perfect*, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of *the whole world.*"[1]

(2.) Condemnation of the idea that in the sacrifices of Masses there is a repetition of the Sacrifice of Christ.

Wherefore the sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said, that the Priests did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits.

[1] In Bullinger's "*Decades*" (1550), a book which exercised considerable influence in England, and was recommended by the Convocation of Canterbury (1586) as a text-book for curates who were not licensed to preach, there is likewise emphasised the sufficiency of the Sacrifice of Christ for the sins of the whole world :—

"Itaque relinquitur jam indubitatum Christum Dominum plenariam esse propitiationem, satisfactionem hostiamque, ac victimam pro peccatis (pro poena, inquam, et pro culpa) *totius mundi*, et quidem solam."

What the Article thus strongly condemns is the popular theory (**vulgo dicebatur**) of the times immediately preceding the Reformation, in consequence of which the number of private Masses had been enormously multiplied, wherein it was supposed that Christ was offered for the **remission of pain** (especially Purgatorial pain) **or guilt**, and whereby both the unique character of the Sacrifice of Christ and the great end of the Institution of the Sacrament (viz., its reception by the faithful) had been obscured.

A strict attention to the precise wording of the Article, and a comparison with the Augsburg Confession (see § 1 above), make it evident that it is not the Primitive and Catholic doctrine as to the Eucharistic Sacrifice which is here condemned, but the common opinion bound up with the pre-Reformation system of **sacrifices of Masses** (note the plural), which had come to be regarded as efficacious for living or dead "ex opere operato," and as affording in themselves a satisfaction apart from, or supplementary to, the Sacrifice of our Saviour Christ upon the Cross.[1]

These "sacrifices of Masses" are said by our Article to be:—

(*a*) **Blasphemous fables**, in that it was taught that Masses are sacrifices for sin distinct from the Sacrifice of Christ.

(*b*) **Dangerous deceits**, or pernicious impostures (**perniciosae imposturae**).

Such strong language is indeed justified, for terrible results had followed upon the popular theory; so many Masses were said for so much money, and in this way (so it was asserted) souls were released from Purgatory. It is easy to see how such a system would degenerate into most disgraceful imposture, and traffic for the sake of gain.

[1] Bishop Gardiner, who was on the whole decidedly conservative in matters of doctrine, protested against the popular conception with which our Article deals. *Cf.*, *e.g.*, his Sermon on S. Peter's Day, 1548:—

> "When men added to the Mass an opinion of satisfaction, or of a new redemption, they put it to another use than it was ordained for."

Cf. the same prelate's words, as quoted by Cranmer, On the Lord's Supper:—

> "This is agreed, and by the Scriptures plainly taught, that the Oblation and Sacrifice of our Saviour Christ was and is a perfect work, once consummate in perfection without the necessity of reiteration, as it was never taught to be reiterated, but a mere blasphemy to presuppose it. It is also in the Catholic teaching, grounded upon the Scripture, agreed that the same Sacrifice once consummate was ordained by Christ's institution in His most Holy Supper to be in the Church often remembered and showed forth" (p. 344).

Cf. the HOMILY FOR REPAIRING AND KEEPING CLEAN OF CHURCHES :—

> "What dens of thieves the churches of England have been made by the blasphemous buying and selling the most precious Body and Blood of Christ in the Mass" (p. 289).

The HOMILY OF THE PLACE AND TIME OF PRAYER also speaks of the

> "gross abusing and filthy corrupting of the Lord's Holy Supper, the Blessed Sacrament of His Body and Blood" (p. 369).

This thirty-first Article, while it "rightly censures that erroneous view of the Sacrifice, does not declare against the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice rightly understood." [1]

It should be noted that the protest contained in the latter half of the Article is connected with the dogmatic statement of the former part by the word "**Wherefore**," indicating that the condemnation of the second part is directed against those who impugned the truth stated in the first, viz., against such as professed to make a fresh propitiation for sin distinct from that made upon the Cross of Calvary, or in any way to supplement "the one Oblation of Christ finished upon the Cross." The Primitive and Catholic doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice (it should scarcely be necessary to state) does not in any way contravene this great truth.

THE SACRIFICIAL ASPECT OF THE HOLY EUCHARIST.

In the Eucharist as a *Sacrament* we receive spiritually the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ ; in the same Eucharist as a *Sacrifice* we in representation plead the one great Sacrifice which our High Priest continually presents for us in Heaven ; for one characteristic idea of the whole service, which comes out with especial prominence in the Primitive Liturgies, is that it is a representation on earth of the pleading of His Atoning Sacrifice by our Lord within the veil (Heb. ix. 24). The Sacrifice was once for all offered on Calvary. It can never be repeated or supplemented (Heb. ix. 25, 26), but its propitiatory virtue is ever-living and continuous (*cf.* Rev. v. 6, 12, where our Lord appears as the "Lamb as it had been slain," bearing before the Father the memorial of His Sacrifice), and the fulness of the propitiation

[1] Palmer's Treatise on the Church, vol. i. p. 400 (ed. 1842).

is pleaded for the whole Church,[1] wheresoever the commemoration of it is exhibited in the Holy Eucharist, wherein we, the members, are joined with our Head in His priestly action. When the priest says, "Lift up your hearts," we are in spirit lifted up to Heaven, entering in spirit the very Holy of Holies, and joining "with angels and archangels, and with all the company of Heaven," in the Triumphal Hymn; then on the Altar, with the very acts and words of Christ, we make before the Father[2] the Memorial which Christ commanded us to make, in correspondence with the continual memorial made by Himself in Heaven.

Testimony to the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

(1.) *Holy Scripture.*

In dealing with the testimony of Holy Scripture, our chief concern must necessarily be to carefully study the significance of our Lord's own words in instituting the Sacrament. In the first place, it cannot escape us that the words occur in a Sacrificial setting; our Lord spoke at a *Sacrificial time.* Close attention to the words of Holy Scripture reveals further that He spoke in *Sacrificial terms,* in words which can only be rightly understood by reference to the old Sacrificial system.

Τοῦτο ποιεῖτε—"Make this your offering."

The verb employed occurs very many times in the Septuagint in the sense "to offer"; *e.g.*, Exod. x. 25, xxix. 38, 39; Lev. ix. 7, xvi. 24; *cf.*, in the New Testament, Heb. xi. 28, and note especially that our Lord Himself uses the same word (S. Matt. xxvi. 18) in this sense with reference to the Passover Feast He was about to celebrate. In the same sense—"to offer"—the word also occurs with reference to the Eucharist in Justin Martyr's "Dialogue with Trypho," c. 41:—

"καὶ ἡ τῆς σεμιδάλεως δὲ προσφορά, ὦ ἄνδρες, ἔλεγον, ἡ ὑπὲρ τῶν καθαριζομένων ἀπὸ τῆς λέπρας προσφέρεσθαι παραδοθεῖσα,

[1] *Cf.* the Prayer of Oblation:—

"We Thy humble servants entirely desire Thy fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; most humbly beseeching Thee to grant, that by the merits and death of Thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in His blood, we and all Thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of His passion."

[2] A memorial before God, and not merely before man, is clearly intended, for the words of Institution are recited and the manual acts performed *in the course of a prayer to God.*

τύπος ἦν τοῦ ἄρτου τῆς εὐχαριστίας, ὃν εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τοῦ πάθους, οὗ ἔπαθεν ὑπὲρ τῶν καθαιρομένων τὰς ψυχὰς ἀπὸ πάσης πονηρίας ἀνθρώπων, Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν παρέδωκε ποιεῖν."

Εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.

Ἀνάμνησις does not occur very frequently in Holy Scripture. In the only other place in which it is found in the New Testament (Heb. x. 3) it is used of a Sacrificial memorial. *Cf.*, in the Old Testament, Lev. xxiv. 7; Num. x. 10, where in each case the word is used with reference to a memorial before God. The Scriptural usage of the word is, in fact, restricted to this meaning.

(2.) *The Primitive Liturgies.*

These afford unmistakable evidence as to the belief of the Primitive Church. Though not actually composed by the Apostles and Fathers whose names they bear, they were the legitimate development of their unwritten traditions respecting the Eucharistic Sacrifice. Certain most important parts of these Liturgies are common to all, and the wording of these portions, it is only reasonable to conclude, may be assigned to a period considerably earlier than that from which the extant Liturgies date; perhaps it would be scarcely too much to say (with the great liturgiologist, Dr. Neale) that it has come down to us without material change from the Apostolic authors themselves. Besides this verbal agreement which appears in certain portions, the general tenor of the Liturgies also presents a remarkable agreement throughout, the same great conceptions with respect to the Sacrament running through all, though they may be expressed in varying phraseology. It can scarcely be doubted that this general tenor has also been derived from the tradition of the Apostles themselves, forming part of the παραθήκη which they handed down to their successors, In comparing the general tenor of the Primitive Liturgies, we must be impressed by the very distinct enunciation of the Sacrificial character of the Holy Eucharist, which is so prominent a feature of them all. We here quote one or two examples:—

Liturgy of S. Clement:

"Μεμνημένοι τοίνυν τοῦ πάθους αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ θανάτου καὶ τῆς ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστάσεως, καὶ τῆς εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἐπανόδου, καὶ τῆς

μελλούσης αὐτοῦ δευτέρας παρουσίας, ἐν ᾗ ἔρχεται μετὰ δόξης καὶ δυνάμεως κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκροὺς καὶ ἀποδοῦναι ἑκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ, προσφέρομέν σοι τῷ βασιλεῖ καὶ Θεῷ, κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ διάταξιν, τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον, καὶ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο, εὐχαριστοῦντές σοι δι' αὐτοῦ, ἐφ' οἷς κατηξίωσας ἡμᾶς ἑστάναι ἐνώπιόν σου, καὶ ἱερατεύειν σοι"

Liturgy of S. James:

"Μεμνημένοι οὖν καὶ ἡμεῖς οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ τῶν ζωοποιῶν αὐτοῦ παθημάτων, τοῦ σωτηρίου σταυροῦ, καὶ τοῦ θανάτου καὶ τῆς τριημέρου ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστάσεως, καὶ τῆς εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἀνόδου, καὶ τῆς ἐκ δεξιῶν σου τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρὸς καθέδρας, καὶ τῆς δευτέρας ἐνδόξου καὶ φοβερᾶς αὐτοῦ παρουσίας, ὅταν ἔλθῃ μετὰ δόξης κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς, ὅταν μέλλῃ ἀποδιδόναι ἑκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ, προσφέρομέν σοι, Δέσποτα, τὴν φοβερὰν ταύτην καὶ ἀναίμακτον θυσίαν, δεόμενοι." . . .

(3.) *Early Christian Writers.*

The Didache (Palestinian Church, close of the first century A.D.):

"Κατὰ κυριακὴν δὲ Κυρίου συναχθέντες κλάσατε ἄρτον καὶ εὐχαριστήσατε προσεξομολογησάμενοι τὰ παραπτώματα ὑμῶν, ὅπως καθαρὰ ἡ θυσία ὑμῶν ᾖ. Πᾶς δὲ ἔχων τὴν ἀμφιβολίαν μετὰ τοῦ ἑταίρου αὐτοῦ μὴ συνελθέτω ὑμῖν, ἕως οὗ διαλλαγῶσιν, ἵνα μὴ κοινωθῇ ἡ θυσία ὑμῶν· αὕτη γάρ ἐστιν ἡ ῥηθεῖσα ὑπὸ Κυρίου· Ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ καὶ χρόνῳ προσφέρειν μοι θυσίαν καθαράν· ὅτι βασιλεὺς μέγας εἰμί, λέγει Κύριος, καὶ τὸ ὄνομά μου θαυμαστὸν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι" (Cap. xiv.).

The reference here is to Mal. i. 11, 14.

S. Ignatius of Antioch (A.D. 100–118):

"Σπουδάσατε οὖν μιᾷ εὐχαριστίᾳ χρῆσθαι· μιὰ γὰρ σὰρξ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἓν ποτήριον εἰς ἕνωσιν τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ, ἓν θυσιαστήριον, ὡς εἷς ἐπίσκοπος ἅμα τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ καὶ διακόνοις, τοῖς συνδούλοις μου· ἵνα, ὃ ἐὰν πράσσητε, κατὰ Θεὸν πράσσητε" (Ad Philadelph., iv.).

Justin Martyr (A.D. 133–165).

See the passage quoted above (p. 255, 256) from the "Dialogue with Trypho," c. 41. In the context Justin quotes Mal. i. 11 as prophetic of the Holy Eucharist.

Irenæus (A.D. 180):

"Igitur Ecclesiae oblatio, quam Dominus docuit offerri in universo mundo, purum sacrificium reputatum est apud Deum, et acceptum est Ei" (Adv. Haer., IV. xviii.).

S. Cyprian (A.D. 250):

"Nam si Iesus Christus Dominus et Deus noster ipse est summus sacerdos Dei patris et sacrificium patri se ipsum primus obtulit et hoc fieri in sui commemorationem praecepit; utique ille sacerdos vice Christi vere fungitur, qui id, quod Christus fecit, imitatur et sacrificium verum et plenum tunc offert in ecclesia Deo patri, si sic incipiat offerre, secundum quod ipsum Christum videat obtulisse" (Ep. lxiii., ed. Goldhorn).

S. Cyril of Jerusalem (A.D. 386):

"Εἶτα ἁγιάσαντες ἑαυτοὺς διὰ τῶν πνευματικῶν τούτων ὕμνων παρακαλοῦμεν τὸν φιλάνθρωπον Θεὸν τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα ἐξαποστεῖλαι ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα, ἵνα ποιήσῃ τὸν μὲν ἄρτον σῶμα Χριστοῦ, τὸν δὲ οἶνον αἷμα Χριστοῦ. πάντως γὰρ οὗ ἂν ἐφάψηται τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, τοῦτο ἡγίασται καὶ μεταβέβληται. Εἶτα μετὰ τὸ ἀπαρτισθῆναι τὴν πνευματικὴν θυσίαν, τὴν ἀναίμακτον λατρείαν, ἐπὶ τῆς θυσίας ἐκείνης τοῦ ἱλασμοῦ παρακαλοῦμεν τὸν Θεὸν ὑπὲρ κοινῆς τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν εἰρήνης, ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου εὐσταθείας, ὑπὲρ βασιλέων, ὑπὲρ στρατιωτῶν καὶ συμμάχων, ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐν ἀσθενείαις, ὑπὲρ τῶν καταπονουμένων, καὶ ἁπαξαπλῶς ὑπὲρ πάντων βοηθείας δεομένων δεόμεθα πάντες ἡμεῖς καὶ ταύτην προσφέρομεν τὴν θυσίαν" (On the Mysteries, v. 7, 8).

(4.) *The Council of Nicæa* (A.D. 325), which we acknowledge œcumenical, in several of its Canons assumes the truth of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. Let one example suffice:—

"Ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν καὶ μεγάλην σύνοδον, ὅτι ἐν τισι τόποις καὶ πόλεσι, τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις τὴν εὐχαριστίαν οἱ διάκονοι διδόασιν. ὅπερ οὔτε ὁ κανὼν, οὔτε ἡ συνήθεια παρέδωκε, τοὺς ἐξουσίαν μὴ ἔχοντας προσφέρειν, τοῖς προσφέρουσι διδόναι τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ" (Canon. xviii.).

(5.) *The Prayer Book.*

It must be admitted that the Sacrificial aspect is not the prominent aspect of the Holy Eucharist dwelt upon in our Communion Office. It was thought necessary for those times by the Reformers to dwell rather upon the Eucharist as the Communion, because of the false conception current that the Offering of Calvary was literally repeated, or supplemented, at every celebration of Mass, and because such false notion had tended to obscure the great end of Christ's Institution, the frequent reception by all the faithful, so that it had come about that the bulk of the people com-

municated very rarely. Hence the Office was entitled "The Order for the Administracion of the Lordes Supper, or *Holye Communion*," and the name "Holy Table," or "Lord's Table," is consistently used for "Altar" throughout in the Prayer Book.

Our Reformers, however, held the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice,[1] and our Office, framed as it was upon ancient models, contains, as we should expect, passages which indisputably testify to the Sacrificial character of the Sacrament; *e.g.*:—

(*a*) The Prayer of Consecration:

> "And did institute, and in his Holy Gospel command us to continue, a perpetual memory[2] of that his precious Death, until his coming again."

The words recited and the acts performed immediately afterwards themselves constitute the memorial, and these occur, it should be specially noted, not in the course of an address to the people, but during a Prayer to God the Father, and are therefore addressed to Him.[3] The Eucha-

[1] Bishop Ridley, owing to his zeal in issuing injunctions (enforced by an Order of the Council, November 24, 1550) for the removal of stone Altars, and substitution of movable Tables, is sometimes referred to as an opponent of the Sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist. It is apparent, however, from many passages in his works (ed. Parker Society) that no one at that time held more strongly to the Primitive doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice than he. We quote one passage from his examination at Oxford (1555):—

> "*Pie.* What say you to that council, where it is said, that the priest doth offer an unbloody sacrifice of the Body of Christ?
> "*Ridley.* I say, it is well said, if it be rightly understood.
> "*Pie.* But he offereth an unbloody sacrifice.
> "*Ridley.* It is called unbloody, and is offered after a certain manner, and in a mystery, and as a representation of that Bloody Sacrifice; and he doth not lie, who saith Christ to be offerred" (p. 250).

[2] The word is, of course, adopted from our Lord's words at the Institution of the Sacrament, and signifies, as has been already indicated (p. 256), a Sacrificial Memorial.

Cf. Church Catechism:—

> "*Question.* Why was the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper ordained?
> "*Answer.* For the continual remembrance of the Sacrifice of the death of Christ, and of the benefits which we receive thereby."

[3] The significance of this will appear the more clearly if we compare the treatment which the Eucharistic Office has received at the hands of those who repudiate all notion of Sacrifice in connection with the Sacrament. While the English Reformers in this, as in other matters, took their stand upon the doctrine and practice of the Primitive Church, Calvin, on the other hand, thus

rist is thus primarily not a solemn reminder to men of Christ's Death, but Christ's own appointed way of pleading before the Father the memory of His Sacrifice.

(*b*) The Prayer of Oblation:[1]

> "We thy humble servants entirely desire thy fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving."

The words "Sacrifice of Praise and Thanksgiving" correspond to "*Sacrificium Eucharisticum*" of the older Service-books, and refer to the action of celebrating the Eucharist, not to the expressions of praise and thanksgiving occurring in the course of the Service.

(*c*) In this connection we may also draw attention to the reintroduction in 1559, by the Ornaments Rubric, of such Vestments of the Ministers "as were in this Church of England, by the authority of Parliament, in the Second Year of the Reign of King Edward the Sixth."[2] The use

speaks of the Sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist as it appears in the writings of the early Fathers:—

> "Sed quia veteres quoque illos video alio hanc memoriam detorsisse quam institutioni Domini conveniebat (quod nescio quam repetitae aut saltem renovatae immolationis faciem eorum Coena prae se ferebat). . . . Excusari tamen non posse arbitror quin aliquid in actionis modo peccaverint. Imitati sunt enim proprius Iudaicum sacrificandi morem, quam aut ordinaverat Christus, aut Evangelii ratio ferebat" (Institutes, IV. xviii. 11).

Accordingly, when laying down the "Manner of Celebrating the Lord's Supper," the Swiss Reformer gives these directions:—

> "After Prayer and the Confession of Faith, to testify in the name of the people that all wish to live and die in the doctrine of Christ, he says aloud, 'Let us listen to the Institution of the Holy Supper by Jesus Christ, as narrated by St. Paul in the eleventh chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians" (Calvin's Tracts, vol. ii. p. 119).

Then follows the reading of the portion of Scripture specified, succeeded by an exposition of it, and an exhortation based upon it. But all this is addressed to the people, and the Sacrament is therefore only a memorial in the sense of a reminder to the people of what Christ has done for them.

Cf. the directions given in the Directory for the Public Worship of God drawn up by the Westminster Assembly of Divines:—

> "Let the words of institution be read out of the Evangelists, or out of the First Epistle of the Apostle Paul to the Corinthians, chap. xi. 23, *I have received of the Lord*, &c., to the 27th verse, which the minister may, when he seeth requisite, explain and apply."

[1] In the Book of 1549 this followed immediately after the Consecration, but since 1552 has been displaced, contrary to all Primitive usage, so that it is said after the Communion of the people.

[2] The precise wording of the Rubric, as inserted in 1559, is as follows:—

> "And here is to be noted, that the Minister at the time of the cōmunion, and at all other tymes in hys ministracion, shall vse suche ornamentes in the

of these vestments was distinctly understood at the time to imply a recognition of the Sacrificial character of the Sacrament.[1]

It is sometimes urged that the absence of the word *Altar* from the Prayer Book indicates the intention of our Church (1552) to reject the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. The word occurs frequently in the Book of 1549, but was dropped in the revision of 1552.[2]

On this point we may note that—

(*a*) In the *Act of Uniformity*, 1552, it was explained that the alterations in the Prayer Book had been made in order to "render the book fully perfect in all such places in which it was necessary to be made more earnest and fit for the stirring up of all Christian people to the true honouring of Almighty God, and with no intention of contradicting the former book." The First Book is, moreover, described as a "very godly order, agreeable to the Word of God and the Primitive Church."

In view of such statements as these we can scarcely interpret the substitution of *Table* for *Altar* as having been made with the intention of the rejecting the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. The true reason of the substitution is no doubt to be found (as has been already indicated) in the feeling of our Reformers that it was necessary for those times to lay special emphasis on the Communion aspect of the Holy Eucharist.

(*b*) The word *Altar* is retained in the Office for the *Coronation* of the Sovereign.

Since we recognise in the Eucharist both Sacrifice and

church, as wer in vse by aucthoritie of parliamēt in the second yere of the reygne of king Edward the VI. according to the acte of parliament set in the beginning of thys booke."

The Prayer Book of 1552, on the other hand, had provided—

"That the minister at the tyme of the Cōmunion and all other tymes in his ministracion, shall use neither albe, vestment, nor cope: but being archbishop or bishop, he shall have and wear a rochet; and being a preest or deacon, he shall have and wear a surplice onely."

[1] See p. 13, note. It should be remembered that the Puritan party petitioned at the Savoy Conference (1661), desiring that the Rubric might be "wholly left out," on the ground that it "seemeth to bring back the cope, albe, &c., and other vestments forbidden by the Common Prayer Book, 5 and 6 Edw. VI." The request was deliberately refused.

[2] The word *Priest*, however, was retained.

Sacrament, we speak of the structure upon which the Elements are consecrated both as the *Altar* and as the *Lord's Table*, or the *Holy Table*. Of the two names "Altar" is much the more ancient, the name "Table" being nowhere used in this connection by the Apostolic Fathers. "God's Board" was a frequent old English appellation for the Altar; *cf.*, *e.g.*, the rubric at the commencement of the Communion Office in the Prayer Book of 1549:—

"Then the Prieste standyng at Goddes borde shall begin."

It seems somewhat strange that those who object to the use of the name "Altar," on the ground that it is not found in the Prayer Book, should themselves habitually speak of the "Communion Table," a name to which their objection equally applies, for it occurs nowhere in the Book of Common Prayer.

For the purpose of comparison we here add extracts from the Canons of the COUNCIL OF TRENT (Session XXII.), which deal with the subject treated in our thirty-first Article:—

CANON I.—"Si quis dixerit, in Missa non offerri Deo verum et proprium sacrificium . . . anathema sit."

CANON III.—"Si quis dixerit, Missae sacrificium tantum esse laudis et gratiarum actionis, aut nudam commemorationem sacrificii in Cruce peracti, non autem propitiatorium; vel soli prodesse sumenti; neque pro vivis et defunctis pro peccatis, poenis, satisfactionibus et aliis necessitatibus offerri debere; anathema sit."

CANON IV.—"Si quis dixerit, blasphemiam irrogari sanctissimo Christi sacrificio in Cruce peracto per Missae sacrificium, aut illi per hoc derogari; anathema sit."

CANON V.—"Si quis dixerit, imposturam esse, Missas celebrare in honorem Sanctorum, et pro illorum intercessione apud Deum obtinenda, sicut Ecclesia intendit; anathema sit."

CANON VIII.—"Si quis dixerit, Missas in quibus solus sacerdos sacramentaliter communicat, illicitas esse ideoque abrogandas; anathema sit."

In a decree of the same Session it is admitted that a "private Mass" is not an ideal service:—

"Optaret quidem sacrosancta Synodus, ut in singulis Missis fideles adstantes non solum spirituali affectu, sed sacramentali

etiam Eucharistiae perceptione communicarent, quo ad eos sanctissimi hujus sacrificii fructus uberior proveniret: nec tamen, si id non semper fiat, propterea Missas illas, in quibus solus sacerdos sacramentaliter communicat, ut privatas et illicitas damnat, sed probat atque adeo commendat" (Cap. vi.).

It must be borne in mind that the above declarations bear date September 17, 1562, and that our Article, since it dates from 1553, could not have been drawn up with reference to the authoritative statements of the Tridentine Council.

The following statements of Continental Confessions may also be compared :—

Augsburg Confession. See § 1, pp. 250, 251.

Tetrapolitan Confession, Cap. XIX.:

"Et contra qui Missas celebrant, praesumunt Christum Patri offerre pro vivis et defunctis, Missamque tale opus faciunt, quo solo fere favor Dei et salus comparetur, quicquid vel credant homines, vel vivant. Unde et pudenda illa ac bis terque impia sacri hujus nundinatio irrepsit, factumque est, ut nihil sit hodie Missa questiosius. Privatas itaque Missas rejecerunt, propterea quod Dominus in commune, discipulis hoc sacramentum commendavit."

Saxon Confession, Art. XV.:

"Multi ante hoc tempus scripserunt, fieri oblationem in missa pro vivis et mortuis, et mereri eam facienti et aliis remissionem peccatorum ex opere operato. . . . Hac opinione cumulabantur sacrificia, et crescebant aucupia quaestus. Talis est et missarum mercatus, et prophanatio coenae Domini, fere in toto orbe terrarum. Vult autem Deus, vitiosos cultus taxari et aboleri. Ideo vocem divinam simpliciter et vere proponimus, quae errores illos damnat. Ac toto pectore adfirmamus coram Deo et tota Ecclesia in coelo et in terra, tantum fuisse unicum sacrificium propitiatorium, seu quo ira aeterni Patris adversus genus humanum placata est; scilicet, totam Filii Dei Domini nostri Jesu Christi crucifixi et resuscitati obedientiam."

Wurtemburg Confession, Art. XIX.:

"Deinde cum sacrificii nomen latissime pateat, ac generaliter significet sacrum cultum, libenter concedimus verum et legitimum usum Eucharistiae posse hoc modo sacrificium dici. Et si Eucharistia juxta institutionem Christi ita celebratur, ut in ea adnuncietur mors Christi, et dispensetur Ecclesiae sacramentum corporis et sanguinis Christi, recte vocatur Applicatio meriti passionis Christi, his videlicet qui sacramentum sumunt."

Second Helvetic Confession, Art. XXI. :

"Missa qualis aliquando apud veteres fuerit, tolerabilis an intolerabilis, modo non disputamus: hoc autem libere dicimus, missam, quae hodie in usu est per universam Romanam Ecclesiam, plurimas et justissimas quidem ob causas, in ecclesiis nostris esse abrogatam, quas sigillatim ob brevitatem nunc non commemoramus. Certe approbare non potuimus, quod ex actione salubri, spectaculum inane est factum, quod item facta est meritoria, vel celebrata pro pretio, quodque in ea sacerdos dicitur conficere ipsum domini corpus, et hoc offerre realiter, pro remissione peccatorum vivorum et mortuorum : adde et in honorem et celebrationem, vel memoriam sanctorum in coelis, etc."

ARTICLE XXXII

OF THE MARRIAGE OF PRIESTS.

Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, are not commanded by God's Law, either to vow the estate of single life, or to abstain from marriage. Therefore it is lawful also for them, as for all other Christian men, to marry at their own discretion, as they shall judge the same to serve better to godliness.

DE CONJUGIO SACERDOTUM.

Episcopis, Presbyteris, et Diaconis, nullo mandato divino praeceptum est ut aut coelibatum voveant, aut a matrimonio abstineant. Licet igitur etiam illis, ut caeteris omnibus Christianis, ubi hoc ad pietatem magis facere judicaverint, pro suo arbitratu matrimonium contrahere.

§ 1.—*SOURCE.*

Composed by the English Reformers. In 1553 the corresponding Article ran as follows:—

THE STATE OF SINGLE LIFE IS COMMANDED TO NO MAN BY THE WORD OF GOD.

Bishoppes, Priestes, and Deacons are not commaunded to vowe the state of single life without mariage, neither by Goddes lawe are thei compelled to absteine from matrimonie.

CŒLIBATUS EX VERBO DEI PRÆCIPITUR NEMINI.

Episcopis, Presbyteris et Diaconis non est mandatum ut cœlibatum voveant; neque jure Divino coguntur matrimonio abstinere.

In 1563 this was recast and added to, a more general title being then prefixed, to suit the reconstructed Article.

In the latter part of our present Article (added in 1563) it is to be noted that clerical marriage is *positively* declared lawful, whereas previously it had been merely stated *negatively* that no Divine command could be urged against it.

§ 2.—*OBJECT.*

To dispel the error that there is anything sinful or contrary to God's law in the marriage of clergy, and to declare that Priests are free to marry, even as laymen are.

The estate of celibacy was held in high esteem among Christians from a very early period. Widows, monks, or nuns who took vows of celibacy were considered to be embracing a higher mode of life. But such celibate life was, at the same time, regarded as a special vocation (*cf.* S. Matt. xix. 10–12; 1 Cor. vii. 7, 8, 38–40), only allowed on condition of strict chastity, and to be forced upon no one, nor on any account to be made a subject of boasting. As early as the third century it was urged that the celibate life should be adopted by the clergy in general, and at the Council of Nicæa (A.D. 325) it was proposed that clergy should be obliged to live apart from their wives whom they had married before their ordination. The proposition was not agreed to, owing to the opposition of Paphnutius, an aged confessor and himself a celibate, and in the result the Council simply prohibited second marriages on the part of the clergy. The Trullan Council, held at Constantinople (A.D. 692), declared that priests and deacons might live with their wives, as the laity do, according to the ancient custom and ordinance of the Apostles. To this decision the Eastern Church has adhered, allowing priests and deacons to live in marriage; only a priest living in celibacy, however, may be chosen as a bishop. In the Western Church various attempts were made by the Popes to enforce celibacy; *e.g.*, by Leo IX. (1048–1054), Nicolas II. (1058–1061), and by Alexander II. (1061–1073), who issued an excommunication against all those who should attend a Mass celebrated by a priest having a wife or concubine. A decree to the like effect was also issued by Gregory VII. (Hildebrand) in 1074, the rule of celibacy for the clergy forming part of the great scheme of that famous Pope for the reorganisation of the Church. Under Anselm, as Archbishop of Canterbury, it was ruled in this country (1102) that no one should be ordained who did not profess celibacy. In 1215 a Canon of the Fourth Lateran Council required celibacy, and from this time forward the Popes made persistent efforts to enforce the rule, so that by the beginning of the sixteenth century the idea that the clergy should live a celibate life had gained such hold that freedom for them to marry was not conceded without considerable opposition.

The Augsburg Confession (Part II. Art. II.) claimed freedom for the clergy to marry upon the ground of (*a*) the Law of God, which no law of man can alter; (*b*) the custom of the Primitive Church; and (*c*) the impure single life of the clergy

which had in fact followed upon the absolute prohibition of their marriage.

In 1538, when certain representatives of the Lutheran Reformers came from Germany to confer with English divines, the rule of celibacy had not been formally abrogated in this country, and the deputies freely censured the enforcement of clerical celibacy, together with other remnants of Mediævalism, such as Communion in one kind, which were still at that time sanctioned in England. In view of their strictures, the third Article of the STATUTE OF SIX ARTICLES (1539) laid down that priests may not marry.

Permission was given for clergy to marry by the Ecclesiastical authorities in the first year of Edward VI., and this was confirmed by an Act of Parliament in the year following.

§ 3.—*EXPOSITION.*

(1.) The negative side of the matter:—

THERE IS NO DIVINE COMMAND FOR CELIBACY OF CLERGY.

Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, are not commanded by God's Law, either to vow the estate of single life, or to abstain from marriage.

It is stated in the New Testament that marriage is honourable in all (Heb. xiii. 4). Some of the Apostles themselves were married men (*e.g.*, S. Peter, S. Mark i. 30; 1 Cor. ix. 5), and the qualifications for the Ministry as given by S. Paul in the Pastoral Epistles have in view a married clergy (1 Tim. iii. 2, 5, 12; Tit. i. 6). We may add that the forbidding to marry is even mentioned as characteristic of the apostasy of later times (1 Tim. iv. 1–3).

(2.) The positive side of the matter:—

THE SAME FREEDOM IS CLAIMED IN THIS MATTER FOR THE CLERGY AS FOR THE PEOPLE.

Therefore it is lawful also for them, as for all other Christian men, to marry at their own discretion, as they shall judge the same to serve better to godliness.

Clergy and laity are alike free to marry, and the same high principle is set before each as the ground of action.

In dealing with the subject of Matrimony, the twenty-fourth Session of the COUNCIL OF TRENT (November 11, 1563) laid down the following Canon:—

> CANON IX.—"Si quis dixerit, Clericos in sacris Ordinibus constitutos, vel Regulares castitatem solemniter professos, posse

matrimonium contrahere, contractumque validum esse non obstante lege ecclesiastica vel voto; et oppositum nil aliud esse quam damnare matrimonium, posseque omnes contrahere matrimonium, qui non sentiunt se castitatis, etiam si eam voverint, habere donum; anathema sit, cum Deus id recte petentibus non deneget, nec patiatur nos supra id quod possumus tentari."

The opinions of some of the leading Reformers on the Continent, and the statements of the chief Continental Confessions, on the subject of the Celibacy of the Clergy may be briefly noted.

Luther himself held very strong opinions on the matter, which he expressed in language characteristically vehement and somewhat unguarded. Monastic vows of celibacy he denounced as impious, and though he himself had taken such vows, he did not scruple to break them, adding to the scandal of his conduct by marrying one who had taken vows as a nun.

The AUGSBURG CONFESSION speaks very strongly of the iniquity of the system of enforcing celibacy as practised at the time:—

"Cum autem extet mandatum Dei, cum mos ecclesiae notus sit, cum impurus coelibatus plurima pariat scandala, adulteria et alia scelera digna animadversione boni magistratus: tamen mirum est, nulla in re majorem exerceri saevitiam, quam adversus conjugium sacerdotum. Deus praecipit honore afficere conjugium. Leges in omnibus rebuspublicis bene constitutis, etiam apud ethnicos, maximis honoribus ornaverunt. At nunc capitalibus poenis excruciantur, et quidem sacerdotes contra canonum voluntatem, nullam aliam ob causam, nisi propter conjugium. Paulus vocat doctrinam daemoniorum, quae prohibet conjugium, 1 Tim. iv. Id facile nunc intelligi potest, cum talibus suppliciis prohibitio conjugii defenditur" (Part II. Art. II.).

Cf. also TETRAPOLITAN CONFESSION, Cap. XII.:

"Proinde nemini obsistere potuimus, qui vitam monasticam, indubitatam jam Satanae servitutem, cum Christiana mutare voluisset. Sicut nec aliis ex ordine ecclesiastico, qui ductis uxoribus, genus vitae amplexi sunt, a quo proximis plus commodi, majorque vitae honestas, quam ab eo in quo erant, expectari potest. Denique nec eos qui apud nos, in verbi Dei ministerio, perseverarunt, arcere a jure conjugii, quicquid castitatis voverint, ob memoratas causas, nobis permisimus, cum divus Paulus praecipuus verae castitatis assertor, Episcopum quoque recipiat maritum."

Bohemian Confession, Art. IX.:

"Docent etiam, ut Sacerdotes negotiis saecularibus non occupentur, praesertim vero, ut ab statu conjugii liberi sint, quo aptiores sint et expeditiores ad serviendum proximi commodis et ecclesiae. Etenim conjugium multa secum adfert impedimenta, quae multos, quo minus bene respondeant suae vocationi, remorantur. Proinde nostri idoneos magis, habilioresque ad Ministerium ecclesiae existimant coelibes, si quibus tamen hoc peculiare donum a Deo datum fuerit.

"Non quod Sacerdotes peccare putent, si matrimonium contrahant, si id moneat necessitas, sintve ad hoc aliae justae rationes. Nam et Paulus aperte docet, ad ecclesiastica munia tractanda, unius uxoris viros eligendos esse."

Calvin's Institutes, IV. xii. 23:

"Una in re plusquam rigidi sunt et inexorabiles, ne conjugium Sacerdotibus permittant. Quanta apud eos scortandi grassetur impunitas dicere nihil attinet, ac foetido suo coelibatu freti occalluerunt ad omnia flagitia, haec tamen prohibitio clare ostendit quam pestiferae sint omnes traditiones, utpote quae non solum orbavit Ecclesiam probis et idoneis Pastoribus, sed horrendam invexit scelerum colluviem, multasque animas in gurgitem desperationis projecit. Certe quod sacerdotibus interdictum fuit conjugium, id factum est impia tyrannide, non modo contra verbum Dei, sed etiam contra omnem aequitatem. Primum vetare quod Dominus liberum reliquisset, nulla ratione hominibus licuit. Deinde nominatim Deum cavisse verbo suo ne haec libertas infringeretur, clarius est quam ut longa demonstratione uti necesse fit."

Saxon Confession, Art. XVIII.:

"Scimus autem voluntatem Dei esse, ne prohibeatur conjugium ullis personis, quae sunt idoneae ad conjugium; et quae extra conjugium non viverent absque periculo conscientiae: sicut Gen. ii., Matt. xix., 1 Cor. vii., scriptum est. Ideo conceditur apud nos conjugium sacerdotibus, et aliis personis, quae pie in conjugio vivere malunt, quam in coelibatu habere sauciatas conscientias, ne Deum invocare et pie vivere possint."

Wurtemburg Confession, Art. XXI.:

"Praeterea non dubitamus, quin qui sunt verae honestatis amantes, sentiant conjugium non tantum laicis, ut vocant, verum etiam ministris Ecclesiae liberum esse. Dicit enim Epistola ad Hebraeos: Honorabile connubium in omnibus, et thorus immaculatus. Et Paulus probat conjugium in Episcopo, et adfirmat prohibitionem conjugii esse Spiritum erroris et doctrinam daemoniorum. . . . Nec obstare debet votum castitatis, propterea

quod tale votum humana superstitione, sine auctoritate verbi Dei, et contra fidem susceptum, non agnoscatur a Deo."

Second Helvetic Confession, Art. XXIX:

"Qui coelitus donum habent coelibatus, ita ut ex corde, vel toto animo, puri sint ac continentes, nec urantur graviter, serviant in ea vocatione Domino, donec senserint se divino munere praeditos, et ne efferant se caeteris, sed serviant Domino assidue, in simplicitate et humilitate. Aptiores autem hi sunt curandis rebus divinis, quam qui privatis familiae negotiis distrahuntur. Quod is adempto rursus dono, ustionem senserint durabilem, meminerint verbi apostolici, Melius est nubere, quam uri, 1 Cor. vii."

It will be observed that the formularies above quoted for the most part use stronger language and go much further (with the exception of the Bohemian and Second Helvetic Confessions, both of which commend the celibate life for such as feel a call thereto) than our Article. Our Article simply says that priests are not Divinely commanded to "vow the estate of single life." The Continental Reformers, generally speaking, in expressing their abhorrence and detestation of the prevalent corruption of the monastic life, were impelled to regard all such vows as contrary to the law of God, and therefore null and void.

ARTICLE XXXIII

OF EXCOMMUNICATE PERSONS, HOW THEY ARE TO BE AVOIDED.

That person which by open denunciation of the Church, is rightly cut off from the unity of the Church, and excommunicated, ought to be taken of the whole multitude of the faithful as an Heathen and Publican, until he be openly reconciled by penance, and received into the Church by a Judge that hath authority thereunto.

DE EXCOMMUNICATIS VITANDIS.

Qui per publicam Ecclesiae denuntiationem rite ab unitate Ecclesiae praecisus est et excommunicatus, is ab universa fidelium multitudine, donec per poenitentiam publice reconciliatus fuerit, arbitrio Judicis competentis, habendus est tanquam Ethnicus et Publicanus.

§ 1.—*SOURCE.*

Composed by the English Reformers, and first appeared as the thirty-second of the XLII. Articles of 1553.

§ 2.—*OBJECT.*

The object both of this Article and of Article XXXIV. is the regulation of the internal discipline and usages of the Church, upon which subject there was much warm discussion in England during the reign of Edward VI.

§ 3.—*EXPOSITION.*

(1.) The Church has the power of Excommunication.

That person which by open denunciation of the Church, is rightly cut off from the unity of the Church, and excommunicated.

In the Christian Church in all ages Excommunication has been practised, as indeed every society, if it is to exist in a healthy condition, must have the power of excluding unworthy members, and such as refuse to comply with the

conditions of membership.[1] The Lord Himself gave to the Church the power of Excommunication (S. Matt. xviii. 15–18), and we have in the New Testament itself evidences of the exercise of the power. (See 1 Cor. v. 3–5; 1 Tim. i. 20; *cf.* Tit. iii. 10.)

In the exercise of the disciplinary power of the Church three stages are to be distinguished:—

(*a*) The offender is repeatedly admonished, in accordance with the Apostolic precept, *αἱρετικὸν ἄνθρωπον μετὰ μίαν καὶ δευτέραν νουθεσίαν παραιτοῦ* (Tit. iii. 10).

Cf. S. Ambrose, De Offic., lib. ii. cap. xxvii.:—

> "Cum dolore amputatur etiam, quae putruit pars corporis, et diu tractatur, si potest sanari medicamentis: si non potest, tunc a medico bono abscinditur. Sic episcopi adfectus boni est, ut optet sanare infirmos, serpentia auferre ulcera, adurere aliqua, non abscidere: postremo quod sanari non potest, cum dolore abscindere."

(*b*) In case he persists in his error he is suspended from Communion. This is called the *Lesser Excommunication*, and did not exclude the offender from the Church, but from participation in the Eucharist and in the prayers of the faithful.

Cf. Theodoret, Epist. lxxvii. ad Eulalium:—

> "Κωλυέσθωσαν μὲν τῆς μεταλήψεως τῶν ἱερῶν μυστηρίων, μὴ κωλυέσθωσαν δὲ τῆς τῶν κατηχουμένων εὐχῆς, μηδὲ τῆς τῶν θείων γραφῶν ἀκροάσεως, μηδὲ τῆς τῶν διδασκάλων παραινέσεως."

This Lesser Excommunication was inflicted for less serious crimes, or upon those who, having committed serious offences, exhibited signs of true repentance, and expressed their willingness to submit to penitential discipline.

(*c*) Lastly, there is the *Greater Excommunication*, or *Anathema*, as it was sometimes called, involving expulsion from the Church (1 Cor. v. 5, *παραδοῦναι τῷ Σατανᾷ*; *cf.* 1 Tim. i. 20), and cutting off the guilty person not only from all share in the holy offices of her members, but even from all Christian fellowship. (See under heading (2.) below.)

[1] We find Excommunication sanctioned under the Old Covenant, involving the separation of the offender from social intercourse and exclusion from participation in any Religious service (Gen. xvii. 14; Exod. xii. 19; Lev. vii. 20; Ezra x. 8; *cf.*, in the New Testament, S. Luke vi. 22, *ἀφορίσωσιν*; S. John ix. 22, *ἀποσυνάγωγος γένηται*; xii. 42; xvi. 2).

This extreme penalty was reserved for such as persevered in sin after repeated warning, or had denied the faith; and those thus cut off, if they remained impenitent, were not allowed Communion even in the hour of death, nor were they permitted the privilege of burial according to the rites of the Church.[1]

It is with this Greater Excommunication that our Article is concerned.

That the Church of England claims the power of using such Excommunication[2] appears further from—

(i.) CANON 65, which gives directions for the public denouncing of excommunicate persons.

(ii.) CANON 85, which, in detailing the duties of Churchwardens or Questmen, specifies—

> "Especially they shall see . . . that all persons excommunicated, and so denounced, be kept out of the Church."

(iii.) The RUBRIC at the commencement of the BURIAL OFFICE, which provides that—

> "The Office ensuing is not to be used for any that die un baptized, or excommunicate, or have laid violent hands upon themselves."

(2.) THE ATTITUDE OF CHRISTIANS TOWARD THE EXCOMMUNICATE.

That person which by open denunciation of the Church, is rightly cut off from the unity of the Church, and excommunicated,

[1] In the eleventh century, owing to the fact that powerful barons, princes, and kings, sometimes defied a sentence of Excommunication, we find the more terrible sentence of *Interdict* occasionally resorted to by the Popes. This was, in fact, an excommunication of a whole district, province, or kingdom, according to the circumstances of the particular case. A well-known example in English history is the Interdict under which Pope Innocent III. laid this country (March 24, 1208) on account of his struggle with King John.

[2] A form of publishing sentence of Excommunication was sanctioned by Convocation in 1571. After recounting the offence, it proceeds thus:—

> "Et quoniam praedictus A.B. conscientia nequitiae suae, ad diem legitime dictum comparere contempsit, et se justitiae contumaciter subduxit, et alios exemplo suo ad similem contumaciam animavit; idcirco hoc etiam vos insuper admonitos volo, episcopum nostrum nomine atque auctoritate Dei optimi maximi excommunicasse illum ab omni societate ecclesiae Dei, et tanquam membrum emortuum amputasse a Christi corpore. Hoc ille in statu versatur hoc tempore, et in tanto discrimine animae suae. Divus Paulus admonitus instinctu divini Spiritus, jubet ut talium hominum societatem, et contubernia fugiamus, ne participes simus ejusdem sceleris. Tamen, ut christiana charitas nos monet, quoniam ipse pro se orari non vult, nec periculum suum intelligit, oremus Deum omnes ejus nomine, ut aliquando agnoscat miseriam, et foeditatem vitae suae, et agat poenitentiam, et convertatur ad Deum: Deus enim noster est misericors, et potest lapsos etiam a morte revocare."

ought to be taken of the whole multitude of the faithful as an Heathen and Publican.[1]

Our Article is here referring to the words of the Lord, Who enjoined that when an obstinate offender refuses to listen to the admonition of the Church he is to be regarded as "an Heathen and Publican" (S. Matt. xviii. 17). The particular terms employed were adopted by our Lord from the phraseology of His Jewish contemporaries, amongst whom both heathen and publicans were looked upon with abhorrence, and held to be without the pale of religious society. We find the Apostles acting upon the rule laid down by the Lord, and directing that those who cause divisions and offences contrary to their doctrine are to be marked and avoided (Rom. xvi. 17). Christians are to withdraw themselves from the brother who walketh disorderly (2 Thess. iii. 6), and to have no company with him who obeys not the Apostolic tradition, or written injunction (2 Thess. iii. 6, 14). The Corinthian Christians are exhorted by S. Paul not to keep company, or even to eat, with the brother who is a fornicator, &c. (1 Cor. v. 11), and the incestuous person whom the Apostle has excommunicated is accordingly to be put away from among them (1 Cor. v. 13). Similarly, S. John directs that the man who transgresseth and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ is not to be received into their houses by his hearers, nor to be bidden God speed (2 S. John 9, 10).

By Excommunication the brotherhood of grace is dissolved, but the brotherhood of nature remains, and, since the power of the Church is only a spiritual power,[2] a man's natural and civil rights are unaffected; so that an excommunicate person does not thereby lose authority over his family, nor a ruler who has been excluded from the Church

[1] *Cf.* Reformatio Legum, "De Haeresibus," Cap. 15:—

"Quasi prius excommunicatio possit in quoquam intelligi, quam Ecclesia sententiam excommunicationis contra illum direxerit, in qua pronunciatur illum non secus vitandum, quam ethnicum et publicanum."

[2] S. Cyprian, ad Pompon. (Ep. iv., ed. Goldhorn), after quoting Deut. xvii. 12, 13, adds:—

"Interfici Deus jussit sacerdotibus suis non obtemperantes et judicibus a se ad tempus constitutis non obaudientes. Et tunc quidem gladio occidebantur, quando adhuc et circumcisio carnalis manebat: nunc autem, quia circumcisio spiritalis esse apud fideles servos Dei coepit, spiritali gladio superbi et contumaces necantur, dum de ecclesia ejiciuntur."

his office or charge in civil matters. With the growth of the temporal power of the Popes, however, Excommunication was made to take effect in the temporal as well as in the spiritual sphere; and the Popes not only used it in such a way as to release men from natural obligations, but in their hands it became a powerful political engine for deposing sovereigns and absolving all subjects from their allegiance. Indirectly this misuse of Ecclesiastical censure favoured the progress of the Reformation, by confirming Henry VIII. and Queen Elizabeth in their alienation from the Roman See.

(3.) The purpose of Excommunication.

It must always be remembered that in pronouncing sentence of Excommunication the Church has a merciful end in view.

(*a*) *Towards the whole Church*—It is a cutting off of the diseased member, so as to save the whole body from contamination (1 Cor. v. 6, 7).

(*b*) *With regard to the excommunicate person*—Even this extreme step is taken with a view to the spiritual benefit of the individual concerned, that he may be ashamed of his wrong-doing (2 Thess. iii. 14) and renounce his error (1 Tim. i. 20), so that eventually the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus (1 Cor. v. 5).

(4.) The means of restoration—Penance.

until he be openly reconciled by penance, and received into the Church by a Judge that hath authority thereunto. (See 2 Cor. ii. 6–10.)

"Penance" signifies repentance and contrition, together with acceptance of the punishment assigned by the Church. It is expressly stated that the offender should be "*openly* reconciled by penance," in order that the reception into the Church again may be as public an act as the formal exclusion. The "Judge that hath authority thereunto" is the Bishop, or the Ecclesiastical Court. In the case of temporary exclusion from Communion (Lesser Excommunication), the Prayer Book directs that the matter is to be referred to the *Ordinary*.

See the Rubric at the commencement of the Communion Office:—

"Provided that every Minister so repelling any, as is specified in this, or the next precedent Paragraph of this Rubrick, shall be

obliged to give an account of the same to the Ordinary within fourteen days after at the farthest. And the Ordinary shall proceed against the offending person according to the Canon." [1]

There are many difficulties in the way of a proper administration of Church discipline, a state of things largely owing to the very imperfect manner in which the Reformation dealt with the Church's disciplinary system.[2] That due exercise of discipline is very necessary to the true well-being of the Church no one can doubt, and its restoration is much to be desired.

Cf. the address in the COMMINATION :—

"Brethren, in the Primitive Church there was a godly discipline, that, at the beginning of Lent, such persons as stood convicted of notorious sin were put to open penance, and punished in this world, that their souls might be saved in the day of the Lord; and that others, admonished by their example, might be the more afraid to offend.

"Instead whereof, (until the said discipline may be restored again, which is much to be wished,) it is thought good," &c.

The COUNCIL OF TRENT (Session XXV., December 4, 1563), while defending a due use of Excommunication and Ecclesiastical

[1] *Cf.* CANON 65 :—

Ministers solemnly to denounce Recusants and Excommunicates.

"All Ordinaries shall, in their several jurisdictions, carefully see and give order, that as well those who for obstinate refusing to frequent Divine Service established by public authority within this realm of England, as those also (especially of the better sort and condition) who for notorious contumacy, or other notable crimes, stand lawfully excommunicate, (unless within three months immediately after the said sentence of Excommunication pronounced against them, they reform themselves, and obtain the benefit of absolution,) be, every six months ensuing, as well in the Parish Church, as in the Cathedral Church of the diocese in which they remain, by the Minister openly, in time of Divine service, upon some Sunday, denounced and declared Excommunicate, that others may be thereby both admonished to refrain their company and society, and excited the rather to procure out a writ *De excommunicato capiendo*, thereby to bring and reduce them into due order and obedience. Likewise the registrar of every Ecclesiastical Court shall yearly between Michaelmas and Christmas duly certify the Archbishop of the Province of all and singular the premises aforesaid."

[2] See letter of Humphrey and Sampson to Bullinger (July 1566) :—

"But what shall we say respecting discipline, the sinews of religion? There is none at all, neither has our Church its rod, or any exercise of superintendence" (Zurich Letters, i. p. 164).

Cf. also letter of Withers to the Elector Palatine, where, speaking of the condition of the Church in England during Elizabeth's reign, he says :—

"But the ministry is in fact nothing at all, nor is there any discipline" (Zurich Letters, ii. p. 163).

censures, recognised that their use without sufficient cause had been productive of evil:—

> "Quamvis excommunicationis gladius nervus sit ecclesiasticae disciplinae, et ad continendos in officio populos valde salutaris, sobrie tamen magnaque circumspectione exercendus est, cum experientia doceat, si temere aut levibus ex rebus incutiatur, magis contemni quam formidari, et perniciem potius parere quam salutem."

Accordingly it was provided that the sword of Excommunication should not be lightly used, and that Ecclesiastical censures should be abstained from when an Execution could be made upon the property or the person of the individual concerned. The decree on the subject concludes with the following words:—

> "Nefas autem sit saeculari cuilibet magistratui prohibere ecclesiastico judici, ne quem excommunicet, aut mandare, ut latam excommunicationem revocet, sub praetextu, quod contenta in praesenti decreto non sint observata: cum non ad saeculares, sed ad ecclesiasticos haec cognitio pertineat. Excommunicatus vero quicumque, si post legitimas monitiones non resipuerit, non solum ac Sacramenta et communionem fidelium ac familiaritatem non recipiatur, sed, si obdurato animo censuris annexus in illis per annum insorduerit, etiam contra eum, tamquam de haeresi suspectum, procedi possit."

The Reformers of the Lutheran or Saxon school upheld the power of the Church to impose penance and to excommunicate; but of all those who separated from the Roman obedience in the sixteenth century, those who followed Calvin were most rigid in their notions of ecclesiastical discipline.[1] *Cf.*, *e.g.*:—

French Confession, Art. XXXIII.:

> "Sequendum nobis putamus, quod Dominus noster Iesus Christus de Excommunicatione statuit, quam quidem approbamus, et una cum suis appendicibus necessariam esse arbitramur."

---

[1] Not a few English Churchmen, who, during their exile from this country owing to the Marian persecution, had come under the influence of the Zurich school of Reformers, were inclined, after their return in Elizabeth's reign, to despise the English Church owing to the laxity which prevailed in the administration of discipline (see p. 276, note 2).

Belgic Confession, Art. XXXII.:

"Nos itaque omnia humana inventa, omnesque leges rejicimus, quae ad Dei cultum sunt introductae, ut iis conscientiae ullo modo illaqueentur, aut obstringantur. Easque solas suscipimus, quae idoneae sunt, vel ad fovendam alendamque concordiam, vel ad nos in Dei obedientia retinendos. Ad id vero imprimis necessaria est excommunicatio, ex praecepto verbi Dei usurpata, et aliae illi annexae disciplinae ecclesiasticae appendices.

ARTICLE XXXIV

OF THE TRADITIONS OF THE CHURCH.

It is not necessary that Traditions and Ceremonies be in all places one, or utterly like, for at all times they have been divers, and may be changed according to the diversities of countries, times, and men's manners, so that nothing be ordained against God's Word.

Whosoever through his private judgment, willingly and purposely doth openly break the traditions and ceremonies of the Church, which be not repugnant to the Word of God, and be ordained and approved by common authority, ought to be rebuked openly, (that others may fear to do the like) as he that offendeth against the common order of the Church, and hurteth the authority of the magistrate, and woundeth the consciences of the weak brethren.

Every particular or national Church, hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies or rites of the Church ordained only by man's authority, so that all things be done to edifying.

DE TRADITIONIBUS ECCLESIASTICIS.

Traditiones atque Ceremonias easdem, non omnino necessarium est esse *ubique aut prorsus* con*similes.* Nam *et variae* semper *fuerunt*, et mutari *possunt, pro regionum*, **temporum**, *et morum diversitate*, modo nihil *contra verbum Dei instituatur.*

Traditiones et ceremonias Ecclesiasticas quae cum verbo Dei non pugnant, et sunt auctoritate publica institutae atque probatae, quisquis privato consilio volens et data opera publice violaverit, is, ut qui peccat in publicam ordinem Ecclesiae, quique laedit auctoritatem Magistratus, et qui infirmorum fratrum conscientias vulnerat, publice, ut caeteri timeant, arguendus est.

Quaelibet Ecclesia particularis, sive nationalis, auctoritatem habet instituendi, mutandi, aut abrogandi caeremonias aut ritus Ecclesiasticos, humana tantum auctoritate institutos, modo omnia ad aedificationem fiant.

§ 1.—*SOURCE.*

The first paragraph is taken, with a few small changes, from the fifth of the XIII. ARTICLES of 1538. (The words common to the two are printed in *italics* in the Latin text.)

In 1563 two additions were made:—

(*a*) In the first paragraph the word "**temporum**" was inserted,

evidently with the view of making the statement of principle more comprehensive.

(*b*) The last paragraph was added, declaring that a national Church has authority to institute and abolish ceremonies. With the wording of this part of the Article we may compare the third of the XI. ARTICLES, which had been issued a few years before (1559):—

> "Every such particular church hath authority to institute, to change, clean to put away ceremonies, and other ecclesiastical rites, as they be superfluous, or be abused, and to constitute other making more to seemliness, to order, or edification."

§ 2.—*OBJECT.*

See the note on the object of Article XXXIII.

§ 3.—*EXPOSITION.*

(1.) UNIFORMITY OF TRADITIONS AND CEREMONIES IS NOT NECESSARY.

It is not necessary that Traditions and Ceremonies be in all places one, or utterly like, for at all times they have been divers, and may be changed according to the diversities of countries, times, and men's manners.

This Article is not concerned with the laws and ordinances of God, which are binding on all men at all times, or with matters of faith which have been once for all delivered (S. Jude *v.* 3), but with things which are, in themselves, more or less indifferent. It is not necessary that there should be complete uniformity everywhere in such matters.[1]

[1] *Cf.* with our Article the following extracts from Continental Confessions:—

AUGSBURG CONFESSION, Part I. Art. VII.:

> "Nec necesse est ubique esse similes traditiones humanas, seu ritus aut ceremonias, ab hominibus institutas."

BOHEMIAN CONFESSION, Art. XV.:

> "Quanquam etiam nostri, non omnium ritus ac mores servant, quod neque fieri potest, neque ut ubiubi in omnibus Ecclesiis idem ritus et ceremoniae serventur necessarium est. . . .
>
> "Ad haec docent, Humanas traditiones pro inviolabilibus ac aeternis legibus non haberi oportere. Verum quemadmodum certis ac justis causis feruntur, ita etiam aliis causis ac rebus exortis, et diversum monentibus, liceat eas absque peccato violare."

FRENCH CONFESSION, Art. XXXII.:

> "Credimus expedire, ut qui electi sunt, ecclesiae alicujus praefecti, inter se dispiciant, qua ratione totum corpus commode regi possit. Ita tamen, ut

(*a*) By *Traditions* are meant customs of the Church produced by the frequent and long-continued usage of the great part of the community.[1] Such usages have, as a matter of fact, varied according to the diversities of times, countries, and men's manners.

We may illustrate this point by reference to the Paschal Controversy in the early ages of the Church. While Anicetus was Pope (A.D. 157–168), S. Polycarp of Smyrna visited Rome and discussed the Paschal question with him, but without arriving at mutual agreement. "For neither could Anicetus persuade Polycarp not to observe it, because he had always observed it with John the disciple of our Lord, and the rest of the Apostles, with whom he associated; and neither did Polycarp persuade Anicetus to observe it, who said that he was bound to maintain the practice of the presbyters before him. Which things being so, they communicated together; and in the church Anicetus yielded to Polycarp, out of respect no doubt, the office of consecrating the Eucharist, and they separated from each other in peace, all the church being at peace; both those that observed and those that did not observe maintaining peace."[2]

(*b*) As to *Ceremonies*, the same principle holds good. Rigid uniformity is not necessary with regard to them, but they

ab eo, quod Dominus noster Jesus Christus instituit, nusquam deflectant. Hoc autem non impedit, quominus quaedam singulis locis peculiaria sint instituta, prout commodum visum fuerit."

SECOND HELVETIC CONFESSION, Cap. XXVII.:

"Quod si in ecclesiis dispares inveniuntur ritus, nemo ecclesias existimet ex eo esse dissidentes. Socrates, Impossibile fuerit, inquit, omnes ecclesiarum, quae per civitates et regiones sunt, ritus conscribere. Nulla religio eosdem ritus custodit, etiamsi eandem de illis doctrinam amplectatur. Etenim qui ejusdem sunt fidei de ritibus inter se dissentiunt. . . . Semper vero ecclesiae in hujusmodi ritibus, sicut mediis, usae sunt libertate. Id quod nos hodie quoque facimus."

[1] The use of the word *Traditions* with this meaning may be illustrated from the HOLY CATECHISM (Orthodox Eastern Church), by Bernadaces (p. 16):—

"*Q.* Are all the sayings of the holy men enlightened and led by the Holy Ghost written, or did some remain unwritten?

"*A.* There remained some unwritten, which have been kept by tradition in the Church from the time of the Apostles to this day.

"*Q.* Give some examples.

"*A.* To turn to the East when we pray, to make the sign of the Cross, for the priests to wear a peculiar dress, for us to kindle lamps in the church, and many other things."

[2] Irenæus, quoted by Eusebius, Hist. Eccles., V. Cap. xxiv.

may be modified by local or temporal circumstances. Thus, to give examples illustrative of the principle of the Article, ceremonies have been affected by—

(i.) *Diversities of countries.*

Baptism is now generally performed amongst us by affusion, and not by immersion.

(ii.) *Diversities of times.*

In early days, when the Church was persecuted, the public assemblies of Christians for worship were held in secret places, in caves, or catacombs. At a later time, when Christianity became the acknowledged religion of the Roman Empire, gorgeous churches were built, and Divine worship celebrated with splendid ritual accessories.

(iii). *Diversities of men's manners.*

The Kiss of Peace, a ceremony connected with the celebration of the Holy Eucharist in primitive times, has been discontinued.

The Article lays down one all-important limit to the diversity of Traditions and Ceremonies by providing **that nothing be ordained against God's Word.**[1]

(2.) THOSE WHO BREAK CHURCH TRADITIONS AND CEREMONIES ON THE GROUND OF PRIVATE JUDGMENT ARE TO BE REBUKED.

Whosoever through his private judgment, willingly and purposely doth openly break the traditions and ceremonies of the Church, which be not repugnant to the Word of God, and be ordained and approved by common authority, ought to be rebuked openly.

Traditions and Ceremonies are in themselves matters indifferent, but when established by the authority of the Church[2] they ought to be observed by all, on account of the reverence due to that authority, which is derived from God, Who has commanded us to obey our spiritual rulers (Heb. xiii. 17). The Christian Religion has for its end the raising and purifying of the individual man and the perfection of human society. Now no virtue tends so much

[1] *Cf.* SAXON CONFESSION, Art. XX. :—

"Est igitur prima regula: Nulli creaturae, non angelis, non hominibus, non regibus, non episcopis licet condere leges aut ritus pugnantes cum verbo Dei."

[2] *Cf.* the first clause of Article XX. :—

"The Church hath power to decree Rites or Ceremonies."

to the accomplishment of this twofold purpose as brotherly love, which, besides rendering the individual like God Himself, Who is Love (1 S. John iv. 8), also creates the strongest union and greatest happiness in human society. Christ Himself did most particularly intend and enjoin that His followers should be joined together in one Body by mutual love (*cf.* S. John xiii. 34, 35; xv. 12; xvii. 21–23). The dissolving of this union, or the dislocating of this Body by the setting up of an individual private judgment against the common authority, and that, too, upon ground of matters in themselves indifferent, must be most reprehensible. People guilty of such action are to be rebuked.[1]

The object of this rebuke is next stated in the Article, viz., **that others may fear to do the like** (*cf.* 1 Tim. v. 20).

Further, three evil consequences are traced to the action of those who openly break the traditions and ceremonies of the Church :—

Whosoever through his private judgment, willingly and purposely doth openly break the traditions and ceremonies of the Church . . . ought to be rebuked openly . . .

(*a*) **as he that offendeth against the common order of the Church,** (1 Cor. xi. 16; xiv. 40)

(*b*) **and hurteth the authority of the magistrate,**

Of course this effect can only follow when Church and State are closely related and civil sanction is given to Ecclesiastical traditions and ceremonies. The giving of such civil sanction to ordinances of the Church dates from the earliest times of the converted Roman Empire.

(*c*) **and woundeth the consciences of the weak brethren** (1 Cor. viii. 12).

It was very necessary for the Church to lay down that those should be rebuked who set up their private judgment against the common order, because considerable confusion was caused by action of this kind in the reign of Edward VI. As an example we might quote the case of Hooper, who, when nominated to the Bishopric of Gloucester (April 7, 1550), refused to be consecrated in what he called the "Aaronic habits,"[2] setting up his

[1] *Cf.* Queen Elizabeth's INJUNCTIONS, 1559 :—

"XXII. That they shall instruct and teach in their cures, that no man ought obstinately and maliciously to break and violate the laudable ceremonies of the Church, commanded by public authority to be observed."

[2] Original Letters, vol. i. p. 87.

own judgment in opposition to the "tradition" of the Church. Cranmer and Ridley, and even Peter Martyr and Bucer, strongly condemned his obstinacy in the matter.

(3.) The power of particular or national Churches in the matter of Rites or Ceremonies.

Every particular or national Church, hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies or rites of the Church ordained only by man's authority.

In the first place we notice that the wording of the Article is carefully guarded. Those rites alone are referred to which are ordained *only by man's authority*. No particular Church, therefore, may change or abolish a ceremony which has the sanction of Divine authority, as the Sacraments have. Since the rites and ceremonies referred to in the Article are in themselves indifferent, and depend for their precise form, to a certain extent, upon local or temporal conditions, it follows that they may be changed. This concluding paragraph of the Article lays it down that each national Church has the power of changing such ceremonies. During the integrity of the Roman Empire the various parts of Europe under the civil dominion of Rome must be regarded as forming one nation; hence the summoning of Councils from the whole Empire to deal with ceremonial matters. Even after the Empire had fallen to pieces, the Church, in those countries of Western Europe which had formed part of the Empire, was for many centuries held together by the supremacy of the Roman See. During the Middle Ages, however, the various nations of modern Europe had been continually gaining independent strength, and at the Reformation, when the Papal Supremacy was thrown off, the power of changing rites and ceremonies was claimed for each separate nation.

Cf. the Preface to the Prayer Book, "*Of Ceremonies, why some be abolished, and some retained*":—

> "And in these our doings we condemn no other Nations, nor prescribe anything but to our own people only: For we think it convenient that every Country should use such Ceremonies as they shall think best to the setting forth of God's honour and glory, and to the reducing of the people to a most perfect and godly living, without error or superstition; and that they should put

away other things, which from time to time they perceive to be most abused, as in men's ordinances it often chanceth diversly in divers countries."

The fact that the Sovereign, as head of the nation, played so prominent a part in the English Reformation, and successfully asserted the supremacy of the Crown in causes Ecclesiastical, also contributed in no small degree to that identification of the Church with the nation, which was an important outcome of the Reformation as it took place in this country.

The Article concludes with a statement of the great principle which should rule all regulations made with respect to rites and ceremonies—

So that all things be done to edifying (Rom. xiv. 19).

ARTICLE XXXV

OF HOMILIES.

The second Book of Homilies, the several titles whereof we have joined under this Article, doth contain a godly and wholesome Doctrine, and necessary for these times, as doth the former Book of Homilies, which were set forth in the time of Edward the Sixth; and therefore we judge them to be read in churches by the Ministers diligently, and distinctly, that they may be understanded of the people.

DE HOMILIIS.

Tomus secundus Homiliarum, quarum singulos titulos huic Articulo subjunximus, continet piam et salutarem doctrinam, et his temporibus necessariam, non minus quam prior Tomus Homiliarum, quae editae sunt tempore Edwardi Sexti. Itaque eas in Ecclesiis per ministros diligenter et clare, ut a populo intelligi possint, recitandas esse judicavimus.

OF THE NAMES OF THE HOMILIES.

1. Of the Right Use of the Church.
2. Against Peril of Idolatry.
3. Of Repairing and Keeping Clean of Churches.
4. Of Good Works, first of Fasting.
5. Against Gluttony and Drunkenness.
6. Against Excess of Apparel.
7. Of Prayer.
8. Of the Place and Time of Prayer.
9. That Common Prayers and Sacraments ought to be Ministered in a Known Tongue.
10. Of the Reverent Estimation of God's Word.
11. Of Alms-doing.
12. Of the Nativity of Christ.
13. Of the Passion of Christ.
14. Of the Resurrection of Christ.
15. Of the Worthy Receiving of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ.
16. Of the Gifts of the Holy Ghost.

17. For the Rogation-Days.
18. Of the State of Matrimony.
19. Of Repentance.
20. Against Idleness.
21. *Against Rebellion.*

§ 1.—*SOURCE.*

The First Book of Homilies was presented to the Convocation of 1543,[1] but not passed. In the year of Edward's accession (1547) it was printed, apparently on the sole authority of Cranmer, and ordered by Royal authority to be read every Sunday in churches.[2] This Book obtained the sanction of Convocation in the thirty-fourth of the XLII. Articles of 1553:—

HOMILIES.	HOMILIAE.
Thomelies of late geuen, and set out by the kinges aucthoritie, be godlie and holsome, conteining doctrine to bee receiued of all menne, and therefore are to be readde to the people diligentlie, distinctlie and plainlie.	Homiliae nuper Ecclesiae Angli-canae per injunctiones Regias traditae atque commendatae, piae sunt atque salutares, doctrinamque ab omnibus amplectendam continent: quare populo diligentur, expedite, clareque recitandae sunt.

It was intended in Edward's reign to issue further Homilies,[3] but the design was frustrated by the death of the king. The precise date of the publication of the Second Book of Homilies

[1] It was the outcome of an agreement of the Bishops—

> "To make certain Homilies for stay of such errors as were then by ignorant preachers sparkled among the people."

[2] The titles of the Homilies contained in the First Book are as follows:—

1. A fruitful Exhortation to the reading of Holy Scripture.
2. Of the Misery of all Mankind.
3. Of the Salvation of all Mankind.
4. Of the True and Lively Faith.
5. Of Good Works.
6. Of Christian Love and Charity.
7. Against Swearing and Perjury.
8. Of the Declining from God.
9. An Exhortation against the Fear of Death.
10. An Exhortation to Obedience.
11. Against Whoredom and Adultery.
12. Against Strife and Contention.

[3] This is indicated in the Rubric after the Nicene Creed in the Prayer Book of 1552:—

> "After the Crede, if there be no sermon, shal follow one of the homelies already set forth, or hereafter to be set forth by commune aucthoritie."

is uncertain, but the present Article (1563) commends it together with the former book. The last Homily, "Against Rebellion," was added in 1571, after the rising in the North (1569).

§ 2.—*OBJECT.*

To commend the doctrine contained in the Books of Homilies, and to provide for the reading of the Homilies in churches.

Cf. Rubric in the Communion Service after the Nicene Creed (1549):—

> "After the Crede ended, shall folowe the Sermon or Homely, or some portiō of one of the Homelyes, as thei shalbe herafter deuided."[1]

See also Queen Elizabeth's INJUNCTIONS (1559):—

> XXVII. "Because through lack of preachers in many places of the queen's realms and dominions the people continue in ignorance and blindness, all parsons, vicars, and curates shall read in their churches every Sunday one of the homilies, which are and shall be set forth for the same purpose by the queen's authority, in such sort, as they shall be appointed to do in the preface of the same."

This was one of the Articles excepted against by the Puritans, who laid great stress upon the necessity of a *preaching* ministry,[2] and also objected to the reading of aught else save Holy Scripture in the public services of the Church.

§ 3.—*EXPOSITION.*

THE MEANING OF THE WORD "HOMILY."

"Homily" is derived from the Greek ὁμιλία, denoting primarily "*social intercourse*," then "*familiar conversation;*"[3] hence its Ecclesiastical meaning, "*a plain, familiar discourse.*"

[1] In 1559 this Rubric was made to read as follows:—

> "After the Crede, yf there be no sermon, shall folowe one of the Homelies alredy set furth, or hereafter to be set furth by commune aucthoritie."

In this form, with the exception that the word "common" has been omitted, it still remains in our Prayer Book.

[2] *E.g.*, at the Savoy Conference (1661) the Puritans made the following exception to the Rubric after the Nicene Creed:—

> "We desire that the preaching of the word may be strictly enjoined, and not left so indifferent, at the administration of the Sacraments."

[3] *Cf.* the use of the cognate verb in Acts xx. 11, ἐφ' ἱκανόν τε ὁμιλήσας ἄχρις αὐγῆς.

(1.) Both Books of Homilies contain a godly and wholesome doctrine, and necessary for the times when they were composed.

The second Book of Homilies, the several titles whereof we have joined under this Article, doth contain a godly and wholesome doctrine, and necessary for these times, as doth the former Book of Homilies, which were set forth in the time of Edward the Sixth.

The approval here given to the two Books of Homilies must not be understood as involving a literal acceptance of every statement or argument contained in them. Passages of Scripture were sometimes then applied in a manner we should not now consider consistent with sound principles of exegesis. Arguments, too, may occur here and there which appear to us unsound or obscure, and which may therefore need correction or explanation. What is required from those who assent to the Articles is a general acceptance of the teaching of the Homilies as testifying to great truths of Christianity, some of which having been more or less obscured by superstition, the emphatic reassertion of them, as in the Homilies, was very necessary at the time of the Reformation.

(2.) The Homilies are to be read in churches.

Therefore we judge them to be read in churches by the Ministers diligently, and distinctly, that they may be understanded of the people.

During the sixteenth century there was much unsettlement and keen controversy upon points both of doctrine and discipline, so that instruction for the people in these matters was very necessary; although it was, at the same time, extremely difficult to provide for it, since very many of the clergy were either illiterate, and on that account not capable of preaching, or else strong partisans of Rome, or (especially in Elizabeth's reign) of Geneva. The incompetence of the clergy for the work of preaching, whether from lack of learning, or from intemperate zeal, is indicated by the fact that preaching was prohibited under each of the four sovereigns, Henry VIII., Edward VI., Mary, and Elizabeth. The Homilies were drawn up and appointed to be read—

(*a*) Partly to supply the defect of sermons, owing to the great lack of competent ministers.

(*b*) Partly in order to secure something like unity of doctrine in those very unsettled times, and thus guard against the many heterodoxies, both old and new, with which the Church was then threatened.

Authorship of the Homilies.

We have no complete record of the authorship of the several Homilies. Those contained in the First Book were published under the superintendence and upon the authority of Cranmer, to whom the composition of Homilies 1, 3, 4, 5 is also generally assigned. No. 2 is attributed to Archdeacon Harpsfield, 6 to Bishop Bonner, and 11 to Thomas Becon.

Of the Second Book the authorship is even more uncertain, though it is sometimes affirmed that Bishop Jewel was chiefly responsible for its compilation.[1] A considerable proportion of the matter is traceable to foreign sources, but the Sermons on the Passion (No. 13) and on the Resurrection (No. 15) are taken from Taverner's "Postils."[2]

[1] This view is given by Forbes and Harold Browne.

[2] A book of sermons on the Epistles and Gospels for Sundays and Holy Days, issued in 1540 under the auspices of Cromwell, the King's Vice-gerent, and with Cranmer's sanction.

ARTICLE XXXVI

OF CONSECRATION OF BISHOPS AND MINISTERS.

The Book of Consecration of Archbishops and Bishops, and Ordering of Priests and Deacons, lately set forth in the time of Edward the Sixth, and confirmed at the same time by authority of Parliament, doth contain all things necessary to such Consecration and Ordering: neither hath it anything, that of itself is superstitious or ungodly. And therefore, whosoever are consecrated or ordered according to the Rites of that Book, since the second year of the afore-named King Edward, unto this time, or hereafter shall be consecrated or ordered according to the same Rites, we decree all such to be rightly, orderly, and lawfully consecrated and ordered.

DE EPISCOPORUM ET MINISTRORUM CONSECRATIONE.

Libellus de Consecratione Archiepiscoporum et Episcoporum, et de Ordinatione Presbyterorum et Diaconorum, editus nuper temporibus Edwardi Sexti, et auctoritate Parliamenti illis ipsis temporibus confirmatus, omnia ad ejusmodi consecrationem et ordinationem necessaria continet, et nihil habet, quod ex se sit aut superstitiosum, aut impium. Itaque quicunque juxta ritus illius Libri consecrati aut ordinati sunt, ab anno secundo praedicti regis Edwardi, usque ad hoc tempus, aut in posterum juxta eosdem ritus consecrabuntur, aut ordinabuntur, rite, atque ordine, atque legitime statuimus esse et fore consecratos et ordinatos.

§ 1.—*SOURCE.*

Composed by the English Reformers in 1563. The corresponding Article of the XLII. ARTICLES of 1553, which was superseded by the present one, ran as follows:—

OF THE BOOKE OF PRAIERS, AND CEREMONIES OF THE CHURCHE OF ENGLANDE.

The Booke which of very late time was geuen to the Churche of Englande by the kinge's auctoritie, and the Parlamente, conteining the

DE LIBRO PRAECATIONUM ET CAERIMONIARUM ECCLESIAE ANGLICANAE.

Liber qui nuperrime authoritate Regis et Parliamenti Ecclesiae Anglicanae traditus est, continens modum et formam orandi, et Sacra

maner and fourme of praiying, and ministring the Sacramentes in the Churche of Englande, likewise also the booke of ordring Ministers of the Churche, set foorth by the forsaied aucthoritie, are godlie, and in no poincte repugnaunt to the holsome doctrine of the Gospel but agreable thereunto, ferthering and beautifying the same not a litle, and therfore of al faithfull membres of the Churche of Englande, and chieflie of the ministers of the worde, thei ought to be receiued, and allowed with all readinesse of minde, and thankes geuing, and to bee commended to the people of God.

menta administrandi in Ecclesia Anglicana: similiter et libellus eadem authoritate editus de ordinatione ministrorum Ecclesiae, quoad doctrinae veritatem, pii sunt, et salutari doctrinae Evangelii in nullo repugnant sed congruunt, et eandem non parum promovent et illustrant, atque ideo ab omnibus Ecclesiae Anglicanae fidelibus membris, et maxime a ministris verbi cum omni promptitudine animorum et gratiarum actione, recipiendi, approbandi, et populo Dei commendandi sunt.

§ 2.—*OBJECT.*

To defend the validity of English Orders, and the Ordinal itself, against objections on the part both of Romanists and Puritans.

§ 3.—*EXPOSITION.*

(1.) The Ordinal (of 1550) contains all things necessary. **The Book of Consecration of Archbishops and Bishops, and Ordering of Priests and Deacons, lately set forth in the time of Edward the Sixth, and confirmed at the same time by authority of Parliament, doth contain all things necessary to such Consecration and Ordering.**

Roman Catholics deny the validity of English Orders. The grounds upon which this denial has been given at various times are:—

(*a*) That there is a break in the continuity of English Orders because the Elizabethan bishops were not properly consecrated (The Nag's Head Fable).

(*b*) That Parker's consecration was invalid because Barlow, his chief consecrator, had never received consecration.

(*c*) That the succession was broken owing to the fact that the consecrators of Parker were "vacant" bishops; *i.e.*, without jurisdiction.

These grounds are now by educated and candid Roman Catholics for the most part given up as untenable.[1]

(*d*) If, therefore, English Orders are invalid, it must be because there is something wanting in the Ordinal itself. Upon this point the whole question now turns. It is admitted on all hands that English Orders were valid up to the year 1550. If they have been invalid since that date, it must be because some necessary thing was omitted in the Ordinal of 1550.

In order to investigate this matter the Ordinal of 1550 must be compared with the Pontifical which it superseded :—

(i.) In the Ordinal the forms for admission to the Minor Orders disappear.

In Anglo-Saxon times five Minor Orders were recognised: (1) Ostiarius, (2) Lector, (3) Exorcist, (4) Acolyte, (5) Subdeacon. But before the Reformation these had long practically ceased to exist, although such Orders were

[1] With regard to—

(*a*) *The Nag's Head Fable.*

This is rejected by Courayer ("Dissertation sur la Validité des Ordinations des Anglois." Published 1723) and by Lingard (vol. vi., Appendix, pp. 670, 671) as unworthy of credit. It originated at Antwerp, forty-five years after the event, with an exiled priest named Holywood.

(*b*) *Barlow's Consecration.*

This is denied because there is no record of it. But the same argument might be used with regard to the consecration of many other bishops of the period; *e.g.*, Gardiner and Lee (Archbishop of York). "Did any one call in question the consecration of those bishops on that account? Why should we doubt the consecration of Barlow and not that of Gardiner? I fear the only reason is this—Gardiner did not consecrate Parker, and Barlow did" (Lingard, quoted in Hook's "Parker," p. 241, note). In answer to the argument *ex silentio*, it should be remembered that Barlow officiated as a bishop in the reign of Henry VIII. at the consecration of Skip (November 23, 1539), and of Bulkeley (February 19, 1542), and that he was treated as a bishop by Queen Mary's Commissioners, and deprived as such (Bailey's "Defence of Holy Orders in the English Church," pp. 39–41). At the same time it should also be noted that, even if Barlow was never consecrated, this would not invalidate Parker's consecration, because there is no doubt with respect to the consecration of the other three bishops present, Scory, Coverdale, and Hodgkins.

(*c*) *Lack of jurisdiction of Parker's consecrators.*

Parker's consecrators were bishops by consecration, and were already also bishops elect to sees which had been vacated by death. Thus there was no intrusion, and the mere fact that they had not "*potestas jurisdictionis*" (since there was no Archbishop to confirm them in the sees to which they had been elected) could not, on any principle, invalidate their "*potestas ordinis.*"

still taken at the universities, perhaps with the very unworthy object in view, that those who took them might be able to plead "*benefit of clergy*."

In the Ordinal of 1550 the Church thus provided for the continuance of those Orders only which, in the light of history, it deemed permanent.

(ii.) On comparing the Ordination of Deacons with the corresponding portion of the Salisbury Pontifical, two points of difference only appear :—

(*a*) The characteristic vestments of a deacon (the stole and dalmatic) are no longer delivered to the person ordained.

(*b*) Deacons are not compared in the Ordinal to the Levites of the Old Testament.

So far it will be generally admitted that nothing essential was omitted in the Ordinal. We come to a difficulty, however, when we ask, 'What are the essentials of Priestly Ordination?' To this question somewhat varying answers have been given :—

(*a*) It is obvious that any acts or words used in conferring Orders which are not universal cannot be held to be essential. The only essentials, therefore, to valid Ordination are the laying on of hands and prayer, since these alone have been used by the whole Church from the beginning (Acts vi. 6, xiii. 3; 1 Tim. iv. 14; 2 Tim. i. 6).

(*b*) There is the view that the "*traditio instrumentorum*" is necessary to a true Ordination. To this the Schoolmen incline, but the custom cannot be traced farther back than the tenth century, and did not obtain in England until the eleventh; moreover, it has never in the Eastern Church formed a part of the Ordination ceremony.[1] The omission of the "*traditio instrumentorum*" cannot, therefore, be held to invalidate English Orders.[2]

[1] Pope Eugenius IV. (1431–1447) lays it down in his Epistle to the Armenians that the "*traditio instrumentorum*" is necessary to valid ordination. It is, however, remarkable that under the same Pope the COUNCIL OF FLORENCE (a continuation of that of Basle—1430—and recognised as œcumenical by the Eastern Church) acknowledged the validity of Orders in the Greek Church, which had always been conferred without the delivery of the chalice and paten.

[2] In the former Ordinal, incorporated with the Prayer Book of 1549, the "*traditio instrumentorum*" had been retained :—

> "The Bisshop shall deliuer to euery one of them, the Bible in the one hande, and the Chalice or cuppe with the breade, in the other hande, and saying," . . .

(*c*) It has sometimes been urged that the recital of the words "*Receive the Holy Ghost*" is essential to a true ordination.[1] This form of words has been retained in the English Ordinal; yet, since it cannot be traced back earlier than the twelfth century, it cannot be maintained that its use is essential.

(*d*) It is sometimes objected by Roman Catholic controversialists that "*intention*" was lacking in the Bishops of the English Church at the Reformation period, and that therefore the Orders conferred by them are invalid. But surely the PREFACE TO THE ORDINAL may be taken as testifying to the right intention of the English Church at that time. It should be noted, too, that this very objection seems to imply that, as far as the actual forms and wording of Edward's Ordinal are concerned, English Orders might be valid.

It thus appears that, viewing the matter historically, the only *absolute essentials* for true Ordination are *laying on of hands* and *prayer*. Nothing essential, therefore, was omitted in the Ordinal of 1550.

With respect to the Form of Consecrating Bishops, it is sometimes objected by Roman Catholics that the Form of 1550 is invalid because it is not specified *at the time of the imposition of hands* what the intention of the rite is, there being no mention of the office of a bishop. It is also urged that the addition made in 1661 to the form of words used at the imposition of hands is tantamount to an admission that the previous form is invalid.[2] In answer to this objection it may be observed:—

---

[1] This is Bellarmine's view. *Cf.* COUNCIL OF TRENT (Session XXIII.):—

CANON IV.—"Si quis dixerit, per sacram ordinationem non dari Spiritum sanctum, ac proinde frustra Episcopos dicere: Accipe Spiritum sanctum . . . anathema sit."

Note that the Council does not declare the use of the words "*Accipe Spiritum sanctum*" to be essential, but merely anathematises those who say that the form referred to is useless.

[2] In the Ordinal of 1550 the form of words to be used at the imposition of hands runs thus:—

"Take the holy goste, and remember that thou stirre up the grace of God, which is in thee, by imposicion of handes: for god hath not geuen us the spirite of feare, but of powere, and loue, and of sobernesse."

This wording remained unchanged in 1559, but in 1661 it was altered to its present form:—

"Receive the Holy Ghost, for the Office and Work of a Bishop in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the Imposition of our hands; In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen. And remember that thou stir up the grace of God which is given thee by this Imposition of our hands: for God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and love, and soberness."

(i.) That the intention of the rite is clearly specified in the Prayer used previously in the service on behalf of the person to be consecrated :—

> "Mercifully behold this thy servant now called to the Work and Ministry of a Bishop."

(ii.) That in the Pontifical of Pope Clement VIII. (1595) the only words used at the imposition of hands are, "Accipe Spiritum Sanctum."

(2.) THE ORDINAL CONTAINS NOTHING SUPERSTITIOUS OR UNGODLY. **Neither hath it anything, that of itself is superstitious or ungodly.**

Two points in the Ordinal gave great offence to the party which sympathised with the Swiss school of Continental Reformers :—

(*a*) The use of the words, "*Receive the Holy Ghost*," which are said, at the imposition of hands, to each one ordained priest, or consecrated bishop. Against the use of this form it was objected that God alone, and not man, can confer the Holy Spirit.

The words in question are taken from our Lord's Commission to the Apostles after His Resurrection (S. John xx. 22). As used in the Ordinal they are a prayer, but of a very special kind, for we know that it is God's will to answer it by accompanying the outward sign of imposition of hands with a special gift of His Spirit. The words are therefore said in sure confidence that the gift accompanies the outward sign. We have, moreover, examples recorded in Scripture of spiritual gifts being conferred instrumentally by man, acting under Divine authority (*e.g.*, Deut. xxxiv. 9 ; Acts viii. 17, xix. 6 ; 2 Tim. i. 6).

(*b*) Against the use of the words, "*Whose sins thou dost forgive*," &c., it was objected that God alone can forgive sins.

The Article defends the Ordinal from the charge of superstition or ungodliness, the Church of England teaching that at Ordination the Priest receives a special gift of the Holy Ghost for his office and ministry, and also the commission to absolve in Christ's Name. (See Notes on Article XXV., under the head of "Penance," pp. 190, 191.)

(3.) THOSE ORDAINED OR CONSECRATED ACCORDING TO THE ORDINAL ARE RIGHTLY ORDAINED AND CONSECRATED.

And therefore, whosoever are consecrated or ordered according to the Rites of that Book, since the second year of the aforenamed King Edward, unto this time, or hereafter shall be consecrated or ordered according to the same Rites, we decree all such to be rightly, orderly, and lawfully consecrated and ordered.

What is here stated follows of course from the first point laid down in the Article, viz., that the Ordinal contains all things necessary to a valid Consecration and Ordination. The reason why the validity of the Orders of those ordained according to the Ordinal (of 1550) is so emphatically insisted on in the present Article is this:— When the Prayer Book was repealed in Mary's reign, the Act mentioned the Ordinal by name as also repealed. On the accession of Elizabeth, when the Prayer Book was restored the Ordinal was not specified by name, it being understood to form part of the Prayer Book; but, on the ground of the omission to mention the Ordinal by name, Bonner, and others of his party, argued that all Ordinations since 1559 were in the eye of the law defective. Hence the necessity of maintaining, as in this Article, that those ordained or consecrated according to the Edwardine form were "rightly, orderly, and *lawfully* consecrated and ordered."

ARTICLE XXXVII

OF THE CIVIL MAGISTRATES.

The Queen's Majesty hath the chief power in this Realm of England, and other her dominions, unto whom the chief government of all estates of this Realm, whether they be Ecclesiastical or Civil, in all causes doth appertain, and is not, nor ought to be subject to any foreign jurisdiction.

Where we attribute to the Queen's Majesty the chief government, by which titles we understand the minds of some slanderous folks to be offended, we give not to our Princes the ministering either of God's Word, or of Sacraments, the which thing the Injunctions also lately set forth by Elizabeth our Queen doth most plainly testify: but that only prerogative, which we see to have been given always to all godly Princes in holy Scriptures by God Himself, that is, that they should rule all estates and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be Ecclesiastical or Temporal, and restrain with the civil sword the stubborn and evil-doers.

The Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this Realm of England.

The Laws of the Realm may

DE CIVILIBUS MAGISTRATIBUS.

Regia Majestas in hoc Angliae regno, ac cæteris ejus dominiis, summam habet potestatem, ad quam omnium statuum hujus regni, sive illi Ecclesiastici sint, sive Civiles, in omnibus causis suprema gubernatio pertinet, et nulli externae jurisdictioni est subjecta, nec esse debet.

Cum Regiae Majestati summam gubernationem tribuimus, quibus titulis intelligimus animos quorundam calumniatorum offendi, non damus Regibus nostris, aut verbi Dei, aut Sacramentorum administrationem, quod etiam Injunctiones ab Elizabetha Regina nostra, nuper editae, apertissime testantur, sed eam tantum praerogativam, quam in Sacris Scripturis a Deo ipso, omnibus piis Principibus, videmus semper fuisse attributam, hoc est, ut omnes status atque ordines, fidei suae a Deo commissos, sive illi Ecclesiastici sint, sive Civiles, in officio contineant, et contumaces ac delinquentes, gladio civili coerceant.

Romanus Pontifex nullum habet jurisdictionem in hoc regno Angliae.

Leges **Regni** possunt Christia-

punish Christian men with death, for heinous and grievous offences.

It is lawful for Christian men, at the commandment of the Magistrate, to wear weapons, and serve in the wars.

nos propter capitalia et gravia crimina morte punire.

Christianis licet ex mandato Magistratus arma portare et justa bella administrare.

§ 1.—*SOURCE.*

This Article first appeared (in a much shorter form) as the thirty-sixth of the XLII. ARTICLES of 1553. It then ran as follows:—

OF CIUILE MAGISTRATES.

The King of Englande is Supreme Head in earth, nexte vnder Christe, of the Churche of Englande, and Irelande.

The Bisshope of Rome hath no iurisdiction in this Realme of Englande.

The ciuile magistrate is ordeined, and allowed of God: wherefore we must obeie him, not onely for feare of punishment, but also for conscience sake.

The ciuile lawes maie punishe Christien men with death, for heinous, and grieuous offences.

It is lawefull for Christians, at the commaundement of the Magistrate, to weare weapons, and to serue in laweful wares.

DE CIVILIBUS MAGISTRATIBUS.

Rex Angliae est supremum caput in terris, post Christum, Ecclesiae Anglicanae et Hibernicae.

Romanus Pontifex nullum habet jurisdictionem in hoc Regno Angliae.

Magistratus civilis est a Deo ordinatus atque probatus, quamobrem illi, non solum propter iram, sed etiam propter conscientiam, obediendum est.

Leges civiles possunt Christianos propter capitalia et gravia crimina morte punire.

Christianis licet ex mandato Magistratus arma portare, et justa bella administrare.

At the Elizabethan revision (1563) the first paragraph was remodelled, the title "*Supreme Head*" being disused, and the words "*chief power*" . . . "*chief government*" substituted for it; at the same time the long second paragraph was added. The object of these changes was to state more guardedly the Royal Supremacy, which in the Edwardine Article had been stated rather baldly, and in a manner liable to an Erastian construction. We know that Queen Elizabeth had scruples in this matter, and was unwilling to be spoken of as "*Head*" of the Church.[1]

[1] See a letter of Jewel to Peter Martyr from London (no date):—

"The Queen declines being styled the head of the Church, at which I certainly am not much displeased" (Zurich Letters, i. p. 24).

Cf. also a letter of Parkhurst to Bullinger (London, May 21, 1559):—

"The Queen is not willing to be called the head of the Church of England,

§ 2.—*OBJECT.*

The object of the Article is evidently twofold:—

(*a*) To assert the Royal, and repudiate the Papal, Supremacy.

(*b*) To condemn Anabaptist zealots, who set the civil authority at defiance and impugned the lawfulness of war.

Cf. Reformatio Legum, "De Haeresibus," Cap. 13:—

> "Quin et Anabaptistarum profligandus est agrestis stupor, qui negant licere Christianis magistratum gerere, quasi propterea Christus in terras descenderit, ut rerum publicarum administrationem aboleret. Imo vero Spiritus Sanctus statuit principes et magistratus esse Dei ministros, ut benefactis favorem suum impartiant, et maleficia suppliciis constringant; quae duo si rebus humanis abessent, maxima sequeretur omnium rerum confusio."

§ 3.—*EXPOSITION.*

(1.) Assertion of the Royal, and repudiation of the Papal, Supremacy.

The Queen's Majesty hath the chief power in this Realm of England, and other her dominions, unto whom the chief government of all estates of this Realm, whether they be Ecclesiastical or Civil, in all causes doth appertain, and is not, nor ought to be subject to any foreign jurisdiction.

The Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this Realm of England.

The principle that every soul owes obedience to the Civil power is laid down in the New Testament; see especially Rom. xiii. 1; 1 S. Pet. ii. 13, 14; and *cf.* Acts xxv. 10, 11, where S. Paul appeals to Cæsar as supreme in his own cause. In the days, however, when the State was not Christian, the difficulty in determining the due relation between the Ecclesiastical and Civil powers was not felt, and the Church shrank from direct connection with the kingdoms of the world. Obedience to the heathen govern-

although this title has been offered her; but she willingly accepts the title of governor, which amounts to the same thing" (Zurich Letters, i. p. 29);

and a letter from Jewel to Bullinger (London, May 22, 1559):—

> "The Queen is unwilling to be addressed, either by word of mouth, or in writing, as the head of the Church of England. For she seriously maintains that this honour is due to Christ alone, and cannot belong to any human being soever; besides which, these titles have been so foully contaminated by Antichrist, that they can no longer be adopted by anyone without impiety" (Zurich Letters, i. p. 33).

ment was indeed enjoined; but in its internal affairs the Church was self-governing, and we even find S. Paul rebuking the Corinthian Christians for going to law in the Civil courts (1 Cor. vi. 1–7). When, after the accession of Constantine, the ruling power of the State became, for the first time, professedly Christian, the previously existing conditions were at once modified. As a result of the "establishment" of Christianity as the Religion of the Empire, actual separation between Church and State became henceforth impossible.

We must here review the historical relations of Church and State in this country, together with the relations of England and Rome:—

(*a*) *In Saxon times.*

It must be remembered that at the time of the introduction of Christianity into the various kingdoms of Saxon England, the adoption of the new religion was looked upon as a public matter, affecting not merely the personal but also the official life of the king, and also the whole national life. From the time that England acquired national unity Church and State grew side by side, and the Church exercised an important influence in the development and consolidation of the life of the nation. At the same time the insular position of the country made it natural that business, Ecclesiastical as well as Civil, should be transacted within the limits of the island.[1] The King, we find, exercised a certain undefined authority, and had to a certain extent a right of intervention in Ecclesiastical affairs.

(*b*) *After the Norman Conquest.*

At the Conquest (1066) the existing relations of Church and State were altered. William had patched up his title to the English throne by Papal approval, and brought England under the visitatorial authority of the Roman See; at the same time he refused to be in any sense the Pope's

[1] The well-known appeal of Wilfrid (Bishop of York) affords a good illustration. Theodore of Tarsus (Archbishop of Canterbury), in reorganising the Church, mapped out dioceses and subdivided the large diocese of York. He proceeded in rather a high-handed manner, and Wilfrid, who from the first had assumed a somewhat unfriendly attitude towards him, objected, appealing in person to the Pope (A.D. 678). The Pope sided with Wilfrid, and by a Bull ordered him to be reinstated in his original and undivided see. The King and the Witan, however, refused to recognise the Pope's decision, and Wilfrid, on his return to this country, was imprisoned *for appealing to a foreign power.*

vassal, and strongly asserted the Royal prerogative. The Pope was to send no legate to this country unless invited to do so by the King, and English Churchmen were forbidden to leave the kingdom, to recognise any Pope, to excommunicate any noble, or to publish any Roman decree or letter without the Royal sanction. Another step taken in the reign of William I., which had very far-reaching consequences, was the separation of the Ecclesiastical and Civil courts. While the King in this matter conferred a great privilege upon the Church, at the same time he took care to retain his supremacy over it; for we find him not only nominating the bishops, but also refusing to allow any Church Synod to make decrees which had not first received his approval.

(*c*) *During the Middle Ages.*

Gregory VII. (Hildebrand), who became Pope in 1073, drew out a great scheme of Papal omnipotence in his famous "*Dictate*" of twenty-seven theses, and from his time we may date the commencement of the great struggle for supremacy between Church and State, taking the form, on the Continent, of a contest between the Pope and the Emperor, and, in this country, of constant friction between the Royal and Papal powers. During the succeeding centuries the Popes established considerable authority over Ecclesiastical affairs and persons, the English kings, however, protesting from time to time against encroachments upon their ancient right.

Henry II., in the *Constitutions of Clarendon* (1164), dealt a severe blow at the Papal power. These Constitutions prevented appeals to foreign Powers, regulated Ecclesiastical appointments, subjected Ecclesiastical property to taxation, and extended the power of the King as against Papal aggression. This attempt to resume the authority of the Crown over Ecclesiastical persons was opposed by Becket, and temporarily thwarted by the strong feeling excited by that prelate's murder.

Under Pope *Innocent III.*, who was contemporary with King *John*, the Papacy triumphed, the English king even consenting to hold his kingdom as a vassal of the Roman See. Yet even here we find signs of resistance to foreign aggression :—

(i.) *Magna Charta* declares (June 15, 1215) that the English Church shall enjoy its full rights and privileges, a provision which clearly revives the anti-Papal part of the Constitutions of Clarendon.

(ii.) Archbishop Langton, when ordered to excommunicate the Barons, refused, even under a threat of suspension from the Pope.

In the reign of *Edward I.* there was strong opposition to the suzerainty of the Roman Pontiff. King and Parliament declared that the Papal claims based on King John's surrender were void, no king having the power to cede the rights of the Crown and the liberties of the Church and nation. In 1307 a Parliament at Carlisle protested against the many forms of Papal exactions, and refused to allow the legate to leave the country with the money which he had collected.

In *Edward III.'s* reign the encroachments of Rome were further limited by the *Great Statute of Provisors* (1351), which guarded the rights of patrons against Papal interference, and by the *Statute of Præmunire* (1353), which made it treason to appeal to the Pope against the King.

A little later, by *13 Richard II. c. 2*, any introduction of Papal bulls or sentences into this country was made penal; and afterwards followed the *Great Statute of Præmunire* (16 Richard II.), which made penal all applications to a foreign jurisdiction, either in the Court of Rome or elsewhere.

(*d*) *At the Reformation.*

In the reign of *Henry VIII.* the struggle between Pope and King was brought to a conclusion, the claims of Rome upon the Crown and nation of England being once for all repudiated. In 1534 the Convocations both of Canterbury and York renounced the Papal Supremacy in this land, affirming "that the Pope of Rome hath no greater jurisdiction conferred upon him by God in Holy Scripture, in this kingdom of England, than any other foreign bishop."[1]

[1] Concil. Magn. Brit., iii. 769, 782.
Cf. also REFORMATIO LEGUM, "De Haeresibus," Cap. 21.—

"Quapropter illorum etiam intolerabilis est error, qui totius Christiani orbis universam Ecclesiam solius Episcopi Romani principatu contineri volunt."

The following great Acts were passed by what is known as the *Reformation Parliament* (1534):—

(i.) 25 Henry VIII. c. 19. *Act of Restraint of Appeals and Submission of Clergy.*

This confirmed the Act for Restraint of Appeals, 24 Henry VIII. c. 12, which finally abolished the Pope's appellate jurisdiction. It also embodied in an Act of Parliament the "*Submission*" which had been wrung from the clergy (February 11, 1531), in which the King was recognised as—

"Ecclesiae et cleri Anglicani singularem protectorem, unicum et supremum Dominum, et, quantum per Christi leges licet, etiam Supremum Caput."

(ii.) 25 Henry VIII. c. 20. *Act for Restraint of Annates. Congé d'élire and Letter missive.*

Annates were the first year's entire profit of a benefice claimed by the Pope, according to a valuation. By this Act these were withheld from Rome, but almost immediately afterwards were, by 26 Henry VIII. c. 3, given to the King.

At the same time the right of the Church to elect her own officers was taken from her, though the formal *Congé d'élire* still remained.

(iii.) 25 Henry VIII. c. 21. *Act concerning Papal Dispensations, Peter's Pence, etc. The exempt monasteries handed over to the King.*

By this Act dispensations, licenses, faculties, &c., formerly granted by the Pope, were transferred to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and England was finally freed from all financial relations with the Roman See.

By the same Act the exempt monasteries, *i.e.*, those which had been previously exempt from the jurisdiction of the Archbishop, or the ordinary, and subject only to the visitatorial jurisdiction of the Pope, were transferred so as to be under the immediate authority of the King as "Supreme Head" of the Church.

(iv.) 26 Henry VIII. c. 1. *Act of Supreme Head.*

This Act declared the King to be "the only Supreme Head on earth of the Church of England, called Ecclesia Anglicana." This title had, indeed, been recognised by the Convocations both of Canterbury and York, but the qualification with which the clergy had accepted the title (viz.,

quantum per Christi leges licet) was omitted in the Act of Parliament. It is true that Henry claimed to be simply reviving the Constitutional Supremacy of the Crown, but the title "Supreme Head" had an ominous sound, and was in itself new. That the clergy realised the danger is evident from the guarded wording of their acknowledgment of the Royal Supremacy in their "*Submission.*" It is, therefore, especially noteworthy that when this acknowledgment was embodied in the Act the qualifying clause was omitted.

By Henry VIII., and by his successor, Edward VI., the Constitutional Supremacy of the Crown was pressed a great deal too far, and used in a wrong way, and that, too, not unfrequently for the most unworthy ends; so that, while claiming to restore the ancient power of the Crown, the Tudors in reality made new claims, and used their power for the spoliation of the Church. The Acts of Parliament mentioned above, while they freed the Church from Papal aggression, at the same time robbed her of immemorial rights and subjected her to royal tyranny. Thus, according to the *Act for Restraint of Appeals*, it is in the King's power—

> "To visit, repress, redress, reform, order, correct, restrain, and amend all such errors, heresies, abuses, contempts and enormities, whatsoever they be, which by any manner of *spiritual jurisdiction*, ought, and may be, lawfully reformed."

The Act also deprived the Church of her right to frame her own Canons and Constitutions. Again the *Act for Restraint of Annates* was accompanied by a tyrannical destruction of the Church's free right to elect to bishoprics. Further, by the *Act concerning Papal Dispensations, &c.*, the exempt monasteries (to be followed a little later by the other monasteries of the kingdom) were given over to the King and his creatures for spoliation. In this case, as also by 26 Henry VIII. c. 3 (transferring Annates, which had been recovered, from the Pope to the King), we find a Papal power or privilege made over to the Crown. The general tendency of Henry's legislation, in fact, was to set the King in the place formerly occupied by the Pope.[1] Under *Edward VI.*

[1] *Cf.* Letter of Withers and Barthelot to Bullinger and Gualter (August 1567):—

> "When the supremacy was transferred to King Henry of pious memory, and all things which by the Canon law belonged to the Roman Pontiff as head of the Church were made over to him, he then being both king and pope" (Zurich Letters, ii. p. 149).

See also Introduction, p. 8 and note 2.

the precedents of the previous reign were followed, and the newly vindicated Supremacy of the Crown in matters Ecclesiastical, as having the right of visitation and reformation, and as being the source of episcopal jurisdiction, was unduly pressed and unconstitutionally used. The visitatorial power of the Crown was most unjustly used for the suppression and spoliation of guilds and chantries (*1 Edward VI. c. 14*). The powers of the bishops were suspended during a Royal Visitation of the kingdom,[1] Ecclesiastical affairs being ordered by *Royal Injunctions*,[2] and the *First Book of Homilies* was set forth solely upon the Royal authority. The "*Order of Communion*" (issued March 8, 1548) had received the formal sanction neither of Convocation nor of Parliament, but owed whatever authority it had simply to a Royal Proclamation.[3] Another example of the high-handed government of the Church through the Privy Council which characterised this reign is seen in the "Order of Council" which commanded the demolition of altars, and, "instead of them, a table to be set up in some convenient part of the chancel within every church."

It is remarkable that *Queen Mary*, in the earlier part of her reign, exercised the Royal Supremacy as freely as her predecessors, retaining the title adopted by her father. As "Supreme Head on earth of the Church of England," she issued *Injunctions*[4] (March 1554) bidding the bishops deprive married clergy, re-establish the ancient services and processions, and set forth homilies; also, by Commissions appointed under the authority of the Crown, she caused all the reforming bishops, on one ground or another, to be deprived.

(2) The Royal Supremacy carefully guarded, so as to exclude Erastianism.

Where we attribute to the Queen's Majesty the chief government, by which titles we understand the minds of some slanderous folks to be offended, we give not to our Princes

[1] The Commission for the Visitation was issued May 4, 1547.

[2] These owed their authority to a most unconstitutional Act of Henry's reign, which made a Royal Proclamation of equal force with an Act of Parliament.

[3] In the Proclamation the King states that the "Order" has been set forth "on the advice of his dear uncle and others of his Privy Council." There is thus no pretence even of Ecclesiastical sanction (Dodd "Church History," vol. ii. Appendix viii.).

[4] This was purely a State Act, without any approval of Convocation.

the ministering either of God's Word, or of Sacraments, the which thing the Injunctions also lately set forth by Elizabeth our Queen doth most plainly testify: but that only prerogative, which we see to have been given always to all godly Princes in Holy Scriptures by God Himself, that is, that they should rule all estates and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be Ecclesiastical or Temporal, and restrain with the civil sword the stubborn and evil-doers.

Under *Queen Elizabeth* the language of Henry VIII.'s legislation with regard to the Royal Supremacy was avoided, as being liable to misconstruction; the obnoxious title, "Supreme Head," was dropped,[1] and anything like an Erastian interpretation of the Supremacy was guarded against by the insertion of this second paragraph in our Article. The avowed aim of the Queen was simply to restore the ancient constitutional right of the English Crown. Thus 1 Elizabeth c. i. is entitled:—

> "An Act for restoring to the Crown the ancient jurisdiction over the State, ecclesiastical and spiritual, and abolishing all foreign power repugnant to the same."

So also in the INJUNCTIONS (1559) it is laid down:—

> "That all deans, archdeacons, parsons, vicars, and all other ecclesiastical persons shall faithfully keep and observe, and as far as in them may lie, shall cause to be observed and kept of other, all and singular laws and statutes made for the restoring to the crown the ancient jurisdiction over the state ecclesiastical, and abolishing of all foreign power, repugnant to the same. And furthermore, All ecclesiastical persons having cure of souls, shall, to the uttermost of their wit, knowledge, and learning, purely and sincerely, and without any colour or dissimulation, declare, manifest and open four times every year at the least, in their sermons and other collations, that all usurped and foreign power, having no establishment nor ground by the law of God, is, for most just causes, taken away and abolished: and that therefore no manner of obedience and subjection within her highness's realms and dominions is due unto any such foreign power. And,

[1] See note on the source of this Article, § 1, above, p. 299; and note also that in the "bidding prayer," while Edward VI. was described as "*Supreme Head* immediately under God of the spiritualty and temporalty" of the Church (Doc. Ann., i. p. 21), Elizabeth is entitled "*Supreme Governor* of this realm as well in causes ecclesiastical, as temporal" (*Ibid.*, p. 235).

> that the queen's power within her realms and dominions is the highest power under God, to whom all men, within the same realms and dominions, by God's laws, owe most loyalty and obedience, afore and above all other powers and potentates in earth" (Doc. Ann., i. pp. 211, 212).

In the Queen's "admonition," embodied in the same Injunctions, the Royal Supremacy is further guarded from an Erastian interpretation:—

> "And further her majesty forbiddeth all manner her subjects to give ear or credit to such perverse and malicious persons, which most sinisterly and maliciously labour to notify to her loving subjects, how by the words of the said oath it may be collected, that the kings or queens of this realm, possessors of the crown, may challenge authority and power of ministry of divine offices in the church; wherein her said subjects be much abused by such evil-disposed persons. For certainly her majesty neither doth, nor ever will challenge any other authority, than that was challenged and lately used by the said noble kings of famous memory, king Henry the Eighth, and king Edward the Sixth, which is, and was of ancient time due to the imperial crown of this realm; that is, under God to have the sovereignty and rule over all manner persons born within these her realms, dominions and countries, of what estate, either ecclesiastical or temporal, soever they be, so as no other foreign power shall or ought to have any superiority over them" (Doc. Ann., pp. 232, 233).

We may here draw attention to the attitude of the English Church towards the Pope. It does not deny that he is, as Bishop of Rome, a true bishop of the Catholic Church of Christ, but only protests against his usurped jurisdiction in this realm. It should also be noted that, while in the Injunctions of Edward VI. there is express mention of "the bishop of Rome his pretensed and usurped power and jurisdiction,"[1] in Elizabeth's Injunctions reference is simply made in general terms to "usurped and foreign power." At the Elizabethan revision of the Prayer Book (1559), too, the clause, "from the tyranny of the bishop of Rome, and all his detestable enormities" (Good Lord deliver us), was omitted from the Litany.

This very moderate attitude of the English Church stands in contrast with the opinions expressed individually by some of her members, especially those who had sojourned abroad during the

[1] Doc. Ann., i. p. 5.

reign of Queen Mary, and had come under the influence of the Swiss school of Reformers.

See, *e.g.*, letter of Cox to Wolfgang Weidner (from London, May 20, 1559):—

> "Meanwhile we, that little flock, who for these last five years, by the blessing of God, have been hidden among you in Germany, are thundering forth in our pulpits, and especially before our queen Elizabeth, that the Roman pontiff is truly antichrist" (Zurich Letters, vol. i. p. 27).

Letter of Humphrey and Sampson to Bullinger (dated July 1566):—

> "In the ecclesiastical regimen there are retained many traces of the church of antichrist. For as formerly at Rome," &c. (*Ibid.*, p. 164).

Letter of Grindal to Bullinger (London, August 29, 1567):—

> "That tyranny which the pope himself has for so many ages exercised over the church, is altogether abolished; and it is provided that all persons shall in future acknowledge him to be the very antichrist, and son of perdition, of whom Paul speaks" (*Ibid.*, p. 199).

Letter of Richard Hilles to Bullinger (London, July 27, 1571):—

> "That labour of yours, of which you inform me, in replying to the whole of that impudent popish bull which the Roman antichrist has vomited forth against our most serene queen, will be, without doubt, very greatly approved by the three bishops aforementioned,[1] to whom you have sent those three copies" (*Ibid.*, p. 242).

Letter of Cox to Rodolph Gualter (Ely, February 4, 1573):—

> "I have your book respecting the pope being antichrist, which this man[2] takes much pains to refute. You will not, I hope, allow him to triumph" (*Ibid.*, p. 282).

Language such as that which occurs in the passages just quoted is directly traceable to reformers of the Swiss school, many of whom maintained that the Pope is Antichrist, and spoke of the Church of Rome in their formularies as the Church of Antichrist.

[1] Viz., the Bishops of York (Grindal), Ely (Cox), and Salisbury (Jewel).
[2] Nicholas Saunders.

Calvin, by the language he uses, suggests that the Church of Rome is "Babylon"—"the synagogue of Satan,"[1] and compares conformity to Rome with apostasy from God, likening it to sacrificing to the calf at Bethel.[2] He, moreover, expressly affirms that the Pope is that Antichrist foretold in Scripture;[3] yet he acknowledges that in the Church of Rome some vestiges of a Church remain.[4]

The FRENCH CONFESSION (Art. XXVIII.) declares:—

> "Papisticos igitur conventus damnamus. . . . Ac proinde arbitramur, omnes eos, qui sese ejusmodi actionibus adjungunt, et iis communicant, a Christi corpore seipsos separare."

Cf. the preface to the Judgment of the SYNOD OF DORT:—

> "Hanc enim Ecclesiam, a Romani antichristi tyrannide et horribili papatus idololatria potenti Dei manu vindicatam." . . .

The outcome of the teaching of *John Knox* and his followers appears in the WESTMINSTER CONFESSION, XXV. 6:—

> "There is no other head of the church but the Lord Jesus Christ: nor can the Pope of Rome in any sense be head thereof; but is that antichrist, that man of sin, and son of perdition, that exalteth himself in the church against Christ, and all that is called God."[5]

It is matter for much thankfulness that these opinions with regard to the Papacy, though shared by some prominent divines of the Elizabethan period, did not find expression in the authorised formularies of the English Church.

[1] INSTITUTES, IV. ii. 4.

[2] INSTITUTES, IV. ii. 9.

[3] INSTITUTES, IV. ii. 12:—

> "Antichristum in templo Dei sessurum praedixerunt Daniel et Paulus: Illius scelerati et abominandi regni ducem et antesignanum apud nos facimus Romanum pontificem."

[4] INSTITUTES, IV. ii. 11:—

> "Ut tamen manebant olim inter Iudaeos peculiares quaedam Ecclesiae praerogativae, ita nec hodie Papistis adimimus quae superesse ex dissipatione vestigia Ecclesiae inter eos Dominus voluit."
>
> . . . . . .
>
> "Sic quum foedus suum in Gallia, Italia, Germania, Hispania, Anglia deposuerit (scil. Deus): ubi illae provinciae Antichristi tyrannide oppressae sunt, quo tamen foedus suum inviolabile maneret, Baptismum primo illic conservavit, foederis testimonium, qui ejus ore consecratus, invita humana impietate vim suam retinet: deinde sua providentia effecit ut aliae quoque reliquiae extarent, ne Ecclesia prorsus interiret."

[5] *Cf.* the similar passage in the IRISH ARTICLES of 1615, Appendix VI.

(3.) The lawfulness of Capital Punishment.

The Laws of the Realm may punish Christian men with death, for heinous and grievous offences.

The principle is laid down in Gen. ix. 6, and under the Mosaic Law not only murder but various other grievous offences were punishable with death (see, *e.g.*, Exod. xxi. 16, 17; Lev. xx. 9 *et seqq.*; Deut. xvii. 2–5, xxii. 20 *et seqq.*). In the New Testament, Rom. xiii. 4 indicates quite clearly that the infliction of capital punishment does not conflict with Christian principle. We see, therefore, that the abolition of the right of capital punishment would deprive the magistracy of a power given in the Old Testament, confirmed in the New, and which it possesses as God's minister.

The reassertion of this right of the civil power was felt to be necessary at the Reformation period, more especially on the Continent, owing to the spread of Anabaptism, which brought anarchy and confusion in its train.

Cf. Augsburg Confession, Part I. Art. XVI.:—

> "De rebus civilibus docent, quod legitimae ordinationes civiles sint bona opera Dei, quod Christianis liceat gerere magistratus, exercere judicia, judicare res ex imperatoriis, et aliis praesentibus legibus, supplicia jure constituere, jure bellare, militare, lege contrahere, tenere proprium, jusjurandum postulantibus magistratibus dare, ducere uxorem, nubere.
>
> "Damnant Anabaptistas, qui interdicunt haec civilia officia Christianis."

The Saxon Confession has a long Article (XXIII.), "De Magistratu politico," in which occurs this passage:—

> "Deinde justitia Dei conspicitur in politica gubernatione; quia vult puniri manifesta scelera a magistratibus: et cum ipsi, qui praesunt, non sumunt supplicia de sontibus, Deus ipse mirabiliter rapit eos ad poenas, et regulariter atrocia delicta punit atrocibus poenis in hac vita, ut dicitur: Qui gladium acceperit, gladio peribit: item, Scortatores et adulteros judicat Deus," &c.

Second Helvetic Confession, Art. XXX.:—

> "Damnamus Anabaptistas, qui ut Christianum negant fungi posse officio magistratus, ita etiam negant quenquam a magistratu juste occidi, aut magistratum bellum gerere posse, aut juramenta magistratui praestanda esse, et caetera."

(4.) The lawfulness of Military Service.

It is lawful for Christian men, at the commandment of the Magistrate, to wear weapons, and serve in the wars.

Christian nations, not less than individual Christians, are forbidden to enter upon strife for ambition's sake or merely upon a principle of revenge (S. Matt. v. 38–41; Rom. xii. 18, 19). "Peace on earth," sang the Angels at the Nativity; yet the true peace which Christ, the Prince of Peace, came to bring was soon seen to involve conflict with the evil that is in the world. Hence Christ Himself says, "I came not to send peace, but a sword" (S. Matt. x. 34). On account of the evil that is in the world, it will therefore be sometimes necessary for the Christian to fight, since true peace is not peace with evil and wrong. Hence war is sometimes necessary in order to resist unjust oppression or aggression, or for the protection of life, liberty, or independence. The prevalence of war between nations is evidence of the imperfection, or of the want, of international law. If the principles of Christianity and the sentiment of brotherhood, which our holy Religion inculcates, were widely diffused and firmly rooted in the hearts of men, and if a system of international morality were established and generally accepted, then, we imagine, the necessity for war would cease. On account of the mingling of evil with good in the world this state of things has not been attained, but it is the ideal goal to which all progress tends. Thus in the prophetic anticipations in the Old Testament of the reign of Messiah, the cessation of wars between the nations occupies a prominent place (see, *e.g.*, Isa. ii. 4; Hos. ii. 18; Zech. ix. 10). Of course it by no means follows that, in the present condition of the world, peace at any price is to be preferred to war. That it is not in itself wrong to serve in the wars at the command of the civil power may be gathered from—

(*a*) The advice given by S. John the Baptist to soldiers (S. Luke iii. 14).

(*b*) The commendation given to soldiers in several places in the New Testament (*e.g.*, S. Matt. viii. 5–13; Acts x. 1–4), without any intimation that their calling is in itself unholy.

(*c*) The fact that many of the early Christians served in the

army of Imperial Rome,[1] and that many of the saints of the Church have been soldiers.

This concluding paragraph of the Article, like the preceding one, had special reference to the opinions of the Anabaptists. (See the quotations from the AUGSBURG CONFESSION and SECOND HELVETIC CONFESSION given under heading [3].)

[1] *Cf.* Tertullian, Apol., Cap. xxxvii.:—

> "Hesterni sumus, et vestra omnia implevimus, urbes, insulas, castella, municipia, conciliabula, *castra ipsa*, tribus, decurias, palatium, senatum forum; solum vobis reliquimus templa."

The stories of the "Thundering Legion" and of the martyrdom of the Theban Legion are well known.

ARTICLE XXXVIII

OF CHRISTIAN MEN'S GOODS WHICH ARE NOT COMMON.

The Riches and Goods of Christians are not common, as touching the right, title, and possession of the same, as certain Anabaptists do falsely boast. Notwithstanding every man ought of such things as he possesseth, liberally to give alms to the poor, according to his ability.

DE ILLICITA BONORUM COMMUNICATIONE.

Facultates et bona Christianorum non sunt communia, quoad jus et possessionem, ut quidam Anabaptistae falso jactant. Debet tamen quisque de his quae possidet, pro facultatum ratione, pauperibus eleemosynas benigne distribuere.

§ 1.—*SOURCE.*

Composed by the English Reformers, 1552–3.

§ 2.—*OBJECT.*

To condemn theories of Communism urged by the Anabaptists, especially on the Continent, and in some cases with the most terrible results.

The prevalence of Anabaptist opinions in England is indicated in Stat. 32 Henry VIII. cap. 49, § 11, by which they were excluded from the King's pardon who held:—

> "That it is not leafull for a Christen man to beare office or rule in the Commen Welth: That no man's lawes ought to be obeyed: That it is not leafull for a Christen man to take an othe before any judge: . . . That all things be common, and nothing severall."

Cf. REFORMATIO LEGUM, "De Haeresibus," Cap. 14:—

> "Excludatur etiam ab eisdem Anabaptistis inducta bonorum et possessionum communitas, quam tantopere urgent, ut nemini quicquam relinquant proprium et suum. In quo mirabiliter loquuntur, cum furta prohiberi divina Scriptura cernant, et eleemosynas in utroque Testamento laudari videant, quas ex propriis

facultatibus nostris elargimur; quorum sane neutrum consistere posset, nisi Christianis proprietas bonorum et possessionum suarum relinqueretur."

See also the quotation from the AUGSBURG CONFESSION in the notes on Article XXXVII. § 3, heading (3), p. 311.

The BELGIC CONFESSION (Art. XXXVI.) also gives a summary of Anabaptist opinions which are to be condemned:—

"Quamobrem Anabaptistas et turbulentos omnes detestamur qui superiores dominationes et magistratus abjiciunt, jura ac judicia pervertunt, bona omnia communia faciunt, ac denique ordines omnes ac gradus, quos honestatis gratia Deus inter homines constituit, abolent aut confundunt."

The earlier Anabaptists had strong Millenarian expectations; rejecting Infant Baptism, they taught that those who joined them must be baptized anew[1] with the baptism of the Spirit. They also proclaimed the equality of all Christians and community of goods. All external law they abolished.[2] The Bible they regarded as unnecessary, since the perfect children of God have in themselves the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. War was held to be unlawful, and oaths unnecessary, within the kingdom of Christ. These ideal notions the Anabaptists attempted to force by violence upon men unprepared for them, and, rapidly degenerating themselves, Antinomianism became prevalent amongst them. Their fanaticism knew no bounds, and drove them into every kind of madness, excess, and disorder. The outrages at Münster, which city became the scene of the wildest licentiousness, until Romanists and Protestants alike combined to secure its downfall (June 24, 1535), remain engraved upon the pages of history, an awful example of the terrible results to which sincere but ill-guided zeal may lead men.

§ 3.—*EXPOSITION.*

(1.) COMMUNISM IS NOT A NECESSARY OUTCOME OF CHRISTIANITY. **The Riches and Goods of Christians are not common, as touching the right, title, and possession of the same, as certain Anabaptists do falsely boast.**

Some have gathered from Acts ii. 44, iv. 32, that in the

[1] Hence the name "Anabaptist."

[2] See REFORMATIO LEGUM, "De Haeresibus," Cap. 13, quoted on Article XXXVII. § 2. *Cf.* the quotations in the notes on Article XXXVII. § 3, heading (3), p. 311.

earliest days of the Church the Christians at Jerusalem, by the very rules of the Christian society, surrendered all their property as individuals into one common stock; in fact, that Communism was their principle. Such an interpretation must, however, after careful consideration, be rejected on the following grounds:—

(*a*) We have clear evidence that the Apostles did not enforce any such rule of surrender of all private property. Thus S. Peter expressly tells Ananias that he had not been obliged to sell his property at all, and, moreover, that after he had sold it he had not been under any obligation to surrender the proceeds of the sale (Acts v. 4).

(*b*) A system of Communism is, of course, incompatible with Almsgiving, and—

(2.) Almsgiving is a Christian duty.

Every man ought of such things as he possesseth, liberally to give alms to the poor, according to his ability.

Almsgiving was the practice of the early Church on a very large scale (see, *e.g.*, Acts iv. 34–37, xi. 29, 30, xx. 35, xxiv. 17; Rom. xv. 25; 1 Cor. xvi. 1–3; Gal. ii. 10; 1 Tim. vi. 17, 18), in accordance with our Lord's own teaching (S. Matt. vi. 1–4; S. Mark x. 21, 22; S. Luke xxi. 1–4). In Acts ii. 44, iv. 32, we conclude, therefore, that S. Luke is describing, not an institution, but the spirit and temper of the first Christians. The Apostles, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, understood our Lord's teaching too well to convert what He intended to be a voluntary grace into an enforced rule. The sum of the whole matter is that, though Christian men's goods be not common, yet ought they to be communicated to one another, according as the brethren have need (Rom. xii. 13; 1 Cor. xvi. 2; Heb. xiii. 16).

ARTICLE XXXIX

OF A CHRISTIAN MAN'S OATH.

As we confess that vain and rash swearing is forbidden Christian men by our Lord Jesus Christ, and James His Apostle: so we judge that Christian religion doth not prohibit, but that a man may swear when the Magistrate requireth, in a cause of faith and charity, so it be done according to the Prophet's teaching, in justice, judgment, and truth.

DE JUREJURANDO.

Quemadmodum juramentum vanum et temerarium a Domino nostro Jesu Christo, et Apostolo ejus Jacobo, Christianis hominibus interdictum esse fatemur: ita Christianorum religionem minime prohibere censemus, quin jubente magistratu, in causa fidei et charitatis, jurare liceat, modo id fiat juxta Prophetae doctrinam, in justitia, in judicio, et veritate.

§ 1.—*SOURCE.*

Composed by the English Reformers, 1552–3.

§ 2.—*OBJECT.*

This Article has reference to the same disorderly spirits as Article XXXVIII., combating their scruples in the matter of taking oaths.[1]

Cf. REFORMATIO LEGUM, "De Haeresibus," Cap. 15:—

> "Praeterea nec juramentorum Anabaptistae legitimum relinquunt usum, in quo contra Scripturarum sententiam et veteris Testamenti patrum exempla, Pauli etiam Apostoli, imo Christi, imo Dei patris procedunt; quorum juramenta saepe sunt in sacris literis repetita."

See also references given in the notes on Article XXXVII. § 3, heading (3), p. 311, and Article XXXVIII. § 2, pp. 314, 315.

[1] The Quakers, in their refusal either to take or administer an oath, as also in their objection to all war as utterly inconsistent with the spirit of the Gospel, revived the opinions of the Anabaptists.

§ 3.—*EXPOSITION.*

(1.) Vain and rash swearing is forbidden.

As we confess that vain and rash swearing is forbidden Christian men by our Lord Jesus Christ, and James His Apostle:

See the Third Commandment, and the words of our Lord recorded in S. Matt. v. 34–37, and of S. James in his Epistle v. 12. These passages are no doubt the ones referred to in the Article.

(2.) There is nothing contrary to the principles of Christianity in taking an oath before a Magistrate.

so we judge that Christian religion doth not prohibit, but that a man may swear when the Magistrate requireth, in a cause of faith and charity, so it be done according to the Prophet's teaching, in justice, judgment, and truth.

The Gospel prohibitions were evidently directed against "vain and rash swearing," against the habit, to which the Jews of our Lord's time were much addicted, of using oaths upon the most trifling occasions, swearing by Heaven, by Earth, by Jerusalem, and by the head (S. Matt. v. 34–36), without seriously considering themselves bound by such asseverations. In view of this prevalent practice Christ exhorts ἔστω δὲ ὁ λόγος ὑμῶν (*i.e.*, in your common intercourse with one another), Ναὶ ναί, Οὒ οὔ· τὸ δὲ περισσὸν τούτων ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ ἐστιν (S. Matt. v. 37). That our Lord's prohibition of swearing does not extend to solemn oaths before "the Magistrate . . . in a cause of faith and charity" is clear from His own example; for, on being Himself adjured, or called to answer upon oath, before the high-priest's judgment-seat, He refused not to do so (S. Matt. xxvi. 63, 64). In many passages in his Epistles S. Paul also solemnly calls God to witness the truth of his statements (*e.g.*, Rom. i. 9, ix. 1; 2 Cor. i. 18, 23; Gal. i. 20).

That to take an oath is not in itself unlawful appears from several places of Scripture (*e.g.*, Deut. vi. 13; Ps. xv. 1, 4, lxiii. 11), and under the Old Covenant a power was given to the judges of examining persons upon oath (Lev. v. 1). But the same Scripture likewise emphatically declares that, when an oath is taken, it must be done "in justice, judgment, and truth"

(Jer. iv. 2).[1] Further, God Himself is sometimes expressly said to swear (see Gen. xxii. 16; Jer. xliv. 26; Ps. lxxxix. 35, cx. 4, cxxxii. 11; Heb. vi. 13, vii. 21).

To conclude, if men were always truthful there would be no need for the administration of oaths; but while, on account of the evil that is in the world, solemn attestation of the truth by oath is required, it need not be refused by the Christian.

[1] The passage from Jeremiah quoted in the Article is thus explained in the HOMILY OF SWEARING (p. 73, ed. S.P.C.K.):—

> "Whosoever sweareth when he is required of a judge, let him be sure in his conscience that his oath have these three conditions, and he shall never need to be afraid of perjury. First, he that sweareth must swear truly; that is, he must, setting apart all favour and affection to the parties, have the truth only before his eyes, and for love thereof say and speak that which he knoweth to be truth, and no further. The second is, he that taketh an oath must do it with judgment; not rashly and unadvisedly, but soberly, considering what an oath is. The third is, he that sweareth must swear in righteousness; that is, for the very zeal and love which he beareth to the defence of innocency, to the maintenance of the truth, and to the righteousness of the matter or cause, all profit, disprofit, all love and favour unto the person for friendship or kindred, laid apart."

THE RATIFICATION.[1]

This Book of Articles before rehearsed, is again approved, and allowed to be holden and executed within the Realm, by the assent and consent of our Sovereign Lady Elizabeth, by the grace of God, of England, France, and Ireland Queen, Defender of the Faith, &c. Which Articles were deliberately read, and confirmed again by the subscription of the hands of the Archbishop and Bishops of the Upper House, and by the subscription of the whole Clergy in the Nether House in their Convocation, in the year of our Lord God 1571.

The last four Articles of 1553, struck out in 1563, ran as follows:—

ARTICLE XXXIX.

THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD IS NOT YEAT BROUGHT TO PASSE.

The Resurrection of the dead is not as yet brought to passe, as though it only belonged to the soulle, whiche by the grace of Christe is raised from the death of sinne, but it is to be loked for at the laste daie: for then (as Scripture doeth moste manifestlie testifie) to all that bee dead their awne bodies, fleshe, and bone shalbe restored, that the whole man maie (according to his workes) haue other rewarde, or punishment, as he hath liued vertuouslie or wickedlie.

RESURRECTIO MORTUORUM NONDUM EST FACTA.

Resurrectio mortuorum non adhuc facta est, quasi tantum ad animum pertineat qui per Christi gratiam a morte peccatorum excitetur, sed extremo die quoad omnes qui obierunt, expectanda est; tunc enim vita defunctis (ut Scripturae manifestissime testantur) propria corpora, carnes et ossa restituentur, ut homo integer, prout vel recte vel perdite vixerit, juxta sua opera, sive praemia sive poenas reportet.

---

[1] This Ratification dates from 1571, since which time no change has been made in the wording of the Articles.

ARTICLE XL.

THE SOULLES OF THEM THAT DEPARTE THIS LIFE DOE NEITHER DIE WITH THE BODIES, NOR SLEEP IDLIE.

The text of this Article is given in the notes on Article XXII., p. 149, footnote.

ARTICLE XLI.

HERETICKES CALLED MILLENARII.

Thei that goe about to renewe the fable of heretickes called Millenarii, be repugnant to holie Scripture, and caste them selues headlong into a Juishe dotage.

MILLENARII.

Qui Millenariorum fabulam revocare conantur, sacris literis adversantur, et in Judaica deliramenta sese praecipitant.

ARTICLE XLII.

ALL MEN SHALL NOT BEE SAUED AT THE LENGTH.

Thei also are worthie of condemnacion, who indeuoure at this time to restore the dangerouse opinion, that al menne, be thei neuer so ungodlie, shall at length bee saued, when thei haue suffered paines for their sinnes a certaine time appoincted by Goddes justice.

NON OMNES TANDEM SERVANDI SUNT.

Hi quoque damnatione digni sunt, qui conantur hodie perniciosam opinionem instaurare, quod omnes, quantumvis impii, servandi sunt tandem, cum definito tempore a justitia divina poenas de admissis flagitiis luerunt.

On the omission of these Articles in 1563 see Introduction, p. 14, and compare the paragraph at the end of the notes on Article XVIII., p. 126.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

TABLE OF CONFESSIONS OF FAITH, &c.

Date.	Roman.	Swiss or Reformed.	Lutheran or Protestant.	English.	Scotch.	Irish.
1529		Marburg Articles				
1529			Schwabach Articles			
1530		Fidei Ratio	Augsburg Confession			
1530		Tetrapolitan Confession				
1530			XLIII. Articles (Denmark)			
1532			Bohemian Confession			
1534		First Confession of Basle				
1536		Second Confession of Basle (First Helvetic Confession)		X. Articles		
1536		Calvin's "Institutes"				
1536		Concord of Wittenburg				

TABLE OF CONFESSIONS OF FAITH, &c.—*Continued.*

DATE.	ROMAN.	SWISS OR REFORMED.	LUTHERAN OR PROTESTANT.	ENGLISH.	SCOTCH.	IRISH.
1537			SCHMALKALD ARTICLES	INSTITUTION OF A CHRISTIAN MAN		
1538			XIII. ARTICLES			
1539				STATUTE OF VI. ARTICLES		
1540		CONFESSIO VARIATA				
1543		ARCHBISHOP HERMANN'S "CONSULTATIO"		NECESSARY DOCTRINE FOR ANY CHRISTIAN MAN		
1545	Formal opening of Council of Trent					
1549		CONSENSUS TIGURINUS		FIRST PRAYER BOOK OF EDWARD VI.		
1551			SAXON CONFESSION			
1552			WURTEMBURG CONFESSION	SECOND PRAYER BOOK OF EDWARD VI.	ARCHBISHOP HAMILTON'S CATECHISM	
1553				XLII. ARTICLES.		

TABLE OF CONFESSIONS OF FAITH, &c.—*Continued.*

DATE.	ROMAN.	SWISS OR REFORMED.	LUTHERAN OR PROTESTANT.	ENGLISH.	SCOTCH.	IRISH.
1557		CONFESSIO CZENGERINA (Hungary)				
1558				QUEEN ELIZABETH'S PRAYER BOOK		
1559		FRENCH CONFESSION		XI. ARTICLES		
1560					CONFESSION OF FAITH	
1561		BELGIC CONFESSION			BOOK OF DISCIPLINE	
1562		SECOND HELVETIC CONFESSION				
1563		CATECHESIS HEIDELBERGENSIS		XXXVIII. ARTICLES		
1564	DECREES OF TRENT. CREED OF PIUS IV.					
1566		SECOND HELVETIC CONFESSION adopted in Hungary				XI. ARTICLES of 1559 adopted
1569			AUGSBURG CONFESSION adopted in Denmark			
1570		CONSENSUS OF SANDOMIR (Poland)				

TABLE OF CONFESSIONS OF FAITH, &c.—*Continued.*

DATE.	ROMAN.	SWISS OR REFORMED.	LUTHERAN OR PROTESTANT.	ENGLISH.	SCOTCH.	IRISH.
1571				XXXIX. ARTICLES		
1571				"Reformatio Legum" brought before Parliament		
1573			BOHEMIAN CONFESSION REISSUED			
1577			FORMULA OF CONCORD (BOOK OF BERGEM)			
1593			AUGSBURG CONFESSION adopted in Sweden			
1595				Lambeth Articles		
1615						ARTICLES OF RELIGION
1619		CANONS OF SYNOD OF DORT				
1635						XXXIX. ARTICLES adopted
1646				Attempted Revision of XXXIX. Articles. WESTMINSTER CONFESSION		

TABLE OF CONFESSIONS OF FAITH, &c.—*Continued.*

DATE.	ROMAN.	SWISS OR REFORMED.	LUTHERAN OR PROTESTANT.	ENGLISH.	SCOTCH.	IRISH.
1646				FIRST BAPTIST CONFESSION		
1667				SECOND BAPTIST CONFESSION		
1678				"The chief principles of the Christian Religion as professed by the people called Quakers"		
1743				"The Rules of the Society of the people called Methodists"		
1833				"Declaration of the Faith, Church Order, and Discipline of the Independents"		
1854	IMMACULATE CONCEPTION OF B.V.M. decreed					
1870	PAPAL INFALLIBILITY decreed.					

NOTES ON THE TABLE OF CONFESSIONS

1529. Marburg Articles.—The outcome of a conference at Marburg between the leaders of the Saxon and the Swiss Reformation. These Articles (fifteen in number) are important as being the first series of dogmatic definitions of this period, upon which subsequent symbolical Lutheran writings were modelled.

,, Schwabach Articles.—A revised and augmented edition of the foregoing series. They are seventeen in number, and Lutheran in spirit. Subscription to the series was a necessary condition of membership of the Protestant League.

1530. Fidei Ratio.—A full statement of doctrine, written by Zwingli.

,, Augsburg Confession. — Based upon the Schwabach Articles, and a series of Articles which had been drawn up at Torgau with a view to presenting a statement before the Diet at Augsburg. Melanchthon seems to have had the chief hand in its composition. Its tone is moderate, and it is divided into two parts, as follows:—

I. Articuli Fidei praecipui:

1. De Deo.
2. De Peccato Originis.
3. De Filio Dei.
4. De Justificatione.
5. De Ministerio Eccles.
6. De Nova Obedientia.
7. De Ecclesia.
8. Quid sit Ecclesia.
9. De Baptismo.
10. De Cœna Domini.
11. De Confessione.
12. De Pœnitentia.
13. De Usu Sacramentorum.
14. De Ordine Ecclesiastico.
15. De Ritibus Ecclesiasticis.
16. De Rebus Civilibus.
17. De Christi reditu ad jud.
18. De Libero Aribitrio.
19. De Causa Peccati.
20. De Bonis Operibus.
21. De cultu Sanctorum.

II. Articuli in quibus recensentur abusus mutati:

1. De utraque Specie.
2. De conjugio Sacerdotum.
3. De Missa.
4. De Confessione.
5. De Discrimine Ciborum.
6. De votis Monachorum.
7. De Potestate Ecclesiastica.

1530. XLIII. ARTICLES.—Put forth in the Diet at Copenhagen. These are altogether Lutheran in character. At a later period (1569) the Augsburg Confession was adopted in Denmark.

,, TETRAPOLITAN CONFESSION, the work of Bucer and Capito, was presented to Charles V., in German and Latin, at the Diet of Augsburg, by the representatives of the four cities, Strasburg, Constance, Meiningen, and Linden. This formulary holds an intermediate position between the Saxon and Swiss schools of Reformers, with leanings in the direction of Zwinglianism.

1532. BOHEMIAN CONFESSION, presented to Margrave George of Brandenburg, with a preface by Luther, who, however, did not agree with it in all points. It underwent some modification, and was reissued several times, finally in 1573.

1534. FIRST CONFESSION OF BASLE takes up a conciliatory position between the Saxon and Swiss schools. It was first written in German at Basle, and afterwards turned into Latin.

1536. SECOND CONFESSION OF BASLE (FIRST HELVETIC CONFESSION).—The work of Bullinger, Myconius, and Grynæus. Zwinglian in doctrine.

,, CONCORD OF WITTENBURG.—Drawn up by Melanchthon. The result of a conference between the Saxon school of Reformers, represented by Luther and Melanchthon, and the Swiss school, represented by Bucer and Capito.

,, CALVIN'S "INSTITUTIONIS CHRISTIANÆ RELIGIONIS LIBRI QUATUOR."—Drawn up in the first instance as a defence of the "Reformed" of France, who were subjected to persecution on the ground that they held Anabaptist and revolutionary views. The work was dedicated to King Francis I.

1537. SCHMALKALD ARTICLES.—In 1535 overtures were made by Pope Paul III. for holding a Synod at Mantua, to meet May 1537. The German Reformers objected to a Council constituted in the Papal fashion, and drew up a series of Articles stating the points they were prepared to vindicate. This manifesto is called the "Schmalkald Articles," because it was accepted by the members of the Schmalkaldic League, which had

been formed in March 1531, and by which the Protestant princes united to maintain the ground they had taken up in the Augsburg Confession.

1540. Confessio Variata.—A new edition, by Melanchthon, of the Augsburg Confession. Besides making several less important changes, he here restated the doctrine of the Eucharist in such a manner as to reconcile (so he hoped) the more temperate spirits of the two great Reforming parties, the Saxon and the Swiss.

1543. Archbishop Hermann's "Consultatio." — Hermann, Archbishop and Elector of Cologne, proposed a plan of Reformation at Bonn (March 1542), which was accepted by the nobles. Melanchthon and Bucer were invited to help in the work, and in 1543 was issued "Einfältiges Bedenken." The Latin version of 1545 was entitled "Simplex et Pia Deliberatio."

1549. Consensus Tigurinus.—Drawn up by Calvin. It expresses the union of the Calvinistic and Zwinglian schools of Swiss Reformers, under Calvin and Bullinger respectively, on the question of the Sacraments, to which it is chiefly devoted.

1551. Saxon Confession.—An expanded form of the Augsburg Confession by Melanchthon, who in the Preface describes it as "repetitio Confessionis Augustanae." It was drawn up, upon the re-establishment of the Council of Trent by Pope Julius III. in 1551, in order that it might form a basis of discussion for the Protestant representatives at the Council.

1552. Wurtemburg Confession.—Drawn up with the same object as the last, and actually presented to the Council of Trent, January 24, 1552. It was composed by Brenz at the request of Duke Christopher of Wurtemburg. The relation which this Confession bears to that of Augsburg is indicated in the Preface:—"Res in eo tum statu erant, ut nobis peculiaris confessio conscribenda, et Tridentino Conventui exhibenda esset, qua tamen tantum abest, ut ab Augustana Confessione recesserimus, ut eam potius compendio quodam complecti, et repetere voluerimus."

„ Archbishop Hamilton's Catechism.—Promulgated by the Synod of the Scotch Church at S. Andrews, and

ordered to be read to their parishioners by the clergy. It contains an exposition of (1) the Ten Commandments, (2) the Creed, (3) the Seven Sacraments, (4) the Lord's Prayer, (5) the Ave Maria, and, lastly, an article on Prayer, to whom it should be made, and for whom. The Catechism contains all that we call Roman doctrine, but it is very remarkable that the Pope is not once mentioned in it, although as yet there had been no breach of the Scottish Church with Rome.

1557. Confessio Czengerina. — Matthias Devay, a pupil of Luther, was the chief preacher of the Reformation in Hungary. Of those who accepted it, some adopted the Lutheran tenets, some the Swiss views, but the latter ultimately prevailed. The "Confessio Czengerina," drawn up at Czenger, is marked by a bias for Calvinistic doctrine. The Second Helvetic Confession was adopted in 1566 as the standard of doctrine.

1559. French Confession.—The first Synod of the "Reformed" Church in France was held in May 1559. It drew up and published a Confession of Faith (consisting of forty Articles) in French, with the sanction of Calvin. A Latin version was made in 1566.

1560. Scotch Confession.—Drawn up by Knox, and thoroughly Calvinistic in tone. Ratified by the Parliament, August 17, almost immediately after the death of the Queen Regent (Mary of Guise), June 10.

1561. Book of Discipline.—Accepted by the General Assembly of the Reformed Church of Scotland. A higher grade of ministers, called "superintendents," was retained; but the Second Book of Discipline (1592) adopted the Presbyterian constitution and rigidly Puritan order of worship.

,, Belgic Confession.—Consists of thirty-seven Articles, Calvinistic in their principles, drawn up apparently with the object of disarming the hostility of the civil authorities; the "Reformed" being continually exposed to the risk of being confounded with the Anabaptists.

1562. Second Helvetic Confession.—Composed by Bullinger, and a nearer approach to agreement with the Augsburg Confession than the former Helvetic Confession. On

the Eucharist it is Calvinistic rather than Zwinglian in tone. It was eventually accepted by the Swiss Cantons, and won much approval from the Reformed Churches of other lands.

1563. Catechesis Heidelbergensis.—Composed by Olevianus and Ursinus, under the auspices of Frederic III., Elector Palatine. The line of the "Confessio Variata" is followed, but with perhaps a rather stronger tendency to Calvinism than to Lutheranism. The Calvinistic doctrine of Predestination is avoided, and the Calvinistic doctrine of the Eucharist is stated in a manner approaching as closely as possible to the Lutheran.

1564. Decrees of the Council of Trent.—The first Session of the Council opened December 13, 1545. Sessions II.–V. were held in 1546; Sessions VI.–X. in 1547; Sessions XI.–XIV. in 1551; Sessions XV.–XVI. in 1552; Sessions XVII.–XXII. in 1562; Sessions XXIII.–XXIV. in 1563. The work which the Council did for the Church of Rome may be thus summarised:—(I.) As regards doctrine—it formulated and authorised the doctrines which had been growing up in the Mediæval Church. A definite doctrinal basis was thus laid down for the Church of Rome to work upon, and a final line of separation drawn between Romanist on the one hand, and Lutheran, Calvinist, and Zwinglian on the other; also between Tridentine Christianity and those who claim to hold unbroken continuity of faith and life with primitive Christianity. (II.) As regards discipline—it was truly a Reforming Council; the attempt of the Church of Rome to remove the abuses against which the conscience of Christendom had protested.

„ Creed of Pius IV.—Appends to the Nicene Creed the essence of the doctrinal decrees and canons of the Council of Trent.

1570. Consensus of Sandomir.—In Poland there had been much controversy between the Lutherans and the "Reformed," but a union was at last effected between the dissentient parties, both accepting this formulary, which steered a middle course.

1577. Formula of Concord.—The outcome of attempts to settle the internal dissensions of Lutheranism. Compiled by Andreä of Tübingen, Chemnitz of Brunswick, and Chytræus of Rostock. The formulary was completed at Bergem (near Magdeburg), and hence is sometimes called the "Book of Bergem." Its character is not so much that of a popular exposition, but rather that of a scientific theological treatise. It contains (1) the "Epitome," an outline of the Christian faith; and (2) "Solida Declaratio," a full exposition of the first part. In this treatise we have the full development of orthodox Lutheranism, as distinguished from Tridentine Roman Catholicism on the one hand, and Anabaptism on the other, and also from the systematic theology of the Swiss Reformers.

1615. Irish Articles of Religion.[1]—Based to some extent on the XXXIX. Articles, but the Lambeth Articles are incorporated almost verbatim. In 1635 the English XXXIX. Articles were adopted as the Standard of doctrine, Convocation passing a canon which ran thus:—"For the manifestation of our agreement with the Church of England in the confession of the same Christian faith, and the doctrine of the Sacraments, we do receive and approve the Book of Articles of Religion agreed upon by the archbishops and bishops and the whole clergy in the Convocation holden at London, in the year of our Lord 1562." It appears, however, that the Irish Articles of 1615 were not formally abrogated, nor have they been directly repudiated. Archbishop Ussher, indeed, continued to require subscription to the Articles of 1615 as well as to the XXXIX.; but by common consent they are now regarded as having been superseded by the XXXIX. Articles.

1619. Canons of the Synod of Dort.—The Synod was convened for the purpose of settling the theological disputes of the Netherlands, by condemning the famous "Remonstrance," the anti-Calvinistic manifesto of the Arminian party, which had been issued in 1610. Divines attended from England, Scotland,

[1] The text of these is given in full in Appendix VI., p. 351.

Germany, and Switzerland. The Belgic Confession and Catechesis Heidelbergensis were adopted as standards of orthodox doctrine.

1646. Westminster Confession.—The outcome of long and violent debates of the Westminster Assembly, summoned in 1643 to remodel the English Church, and at which Scotch representatives sat. The Confession is strictly Calvinistic in character, and was only heartily accepted in Scotland. It was "approved by the General Assembly 1647, and ratified and established by Acts of Parliament of 1649 and 1690 as the public and avowed Confession of the (Presbyterian) Church of Scotland."

APPENDIX II

A COMPARISON OF THE BISHOPS' BOOK (1537) AND THE KING'S BOOK (1543).

[*The references are to "Formularies of Faith," Oxford*, 1825.]

BISHOPS' BOOK.

CONTENTS.

1. Exposition of the Creed called the Apostles' Creed.
2. Exposition or Declaration of the Seven Sacraments.
3. Exposition of the Ten Commandments.
4. Exposition of the Paternoster, and the Ave, with the Articles of Justification and Purgatory.

KING'S BOOK.

CONTENTS.

The Declaration of Faith.
The Articles of our Belief, called the Creed.
The Seven Sacraments.
The Ten Commandments of Almighty God.
Our Lord's Prayer, called the Paternoster.
The Salutation of the Angel, called the Ave Maria.
An Article of Free Will.
An Article of Justification.
An Article of Good Works.
Of Prayer for Souls Departed.

PREFACE.

READING THE SCRIPTURE.

"For the instruction of this part of the Church, whose office is to teach other, the having, reading, and studying of Holy Scripture, both of the Old and New Testament, is not only convenient, but also necessary: but for the other part of the Church, ordained to be taught, it ought to be deemed

BISHOPS' BOOK.	KINGS' BOOK.
	certainly, that the reading of the Old and New Testament is not so necessary for all those folks, that of duty they ought and be bound to read it, but as the prince and the policy of the realm shall think convenient, so to be tolerated or taken from it. Consonant whereunto the politic law of our realm hath now restrained it from a great many" . . . (p. 218).
Stress is laid on faith (p. 25).	An Article on faith precedes the Exposition of the Creed (pp. 221–225).

EXPOSITION OF THE CREED.

The Intercession of Christ (p. 45).	The Intercession of the Saints in Christ is also dwelt upon (p. 237).
The teaching office of the Holy Spirit (p. 51).	The revelation of truth to the Church by the Holy Spirit is more clearly put (p. 243).
The Holy Catholic Church (pp. 52–57).	The Pope's usurped headship is more strongly denounced (pp. 246, 247).
The share of Christians in the prayers and good works of the saints is dwelt upon here (p. 58).	
The fact that no works of our own can win for us everlasting life is more emphasised in this book (p. 60).	
CERTAIN NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS NECESSARY TO BE TAUGHT UNTO THE PEOPLE FOR THE BETTER INDUCING OF THEM UNTO THE RIGHT UNDERSTANDING OF THE FORESAID CREED.	
Under this heading the intercession of the Saints is mentioned (p. 70).	

BISHOPS' BOOK.	KING'S BOOK.

THE SEVEN SACRAMENTS.

(These are not treated in the same order in the two books.)

	Infant Baptism is treated more fully here (pp. 254, 255).

In both books it is laid down that the Sacrament of Penance is necessary to salvation for those who have committed deadly sin after Baptism (p. 96). | (p. 257).

	Confession to a priest is rather more enlarged upon, while the necessity of faith in the penitent is also strongly insisted upon (p. 258).

In both books the real *corporal* presence of Christ's Body in the Eucharist is asserted.

(p. 100.)	(p. 263.)
	Communion in one kind only is defended (pp. 265, 266).
	Fasting Communion is advocated (p. 268).
The Sacraments of Baptism, Penance, and the Altar are put on a higher level than the others (p. 129).	
	Matrimony is left at liberty to all men saving priests and those who of their own free choice have vowed continency (p. 293).

THE TEN COMMANDMENTS.

The proper use of Images is explained in both books (Second Commandment).

(pp. 135, 136.) | (pp. 299, 300.)

In both books it is declared that to pray direct to the Saints for benefits is to give to the creature the honour due to God only; but we may ask that the intercessions of the Saints be joined to our own (Third Commandment).

(p. 141.) | (pp. 304, 305.)

In both books also the dedication of churches and altars as memorials of the Saints is guarded from superstitious abuse (Third Commandment).

(pp. 141, 142.) | (p. 305.)

In both books the Fourth Commandment is treated as figurative of sanctification of life; people are warned about being over-scrupulous with regard to abstaining from labour on Sunday. Sprinkling of holy water,

BISHOPS' BOOK. KING'S BOOK.

giving of holy bread, bearing candles at Candlemas, giving ashes on Ash-Wednesday, bearing palms on Palm-Sunday, creeping to the Cross on Good Friday, setting up the Sepulchre of Christ, &c., are defended as edifying ceremonies.

(pp. 142–147.)

CERTAIN NOTES NECESSARY TO BE LEARNED FOR THE BETTER UNDERSTANDING OF THE TEN COMMANDMENTS.

(pp. 306–311.)

Those who get their living by begging are condemned as breakers of the Eighth Commandment (p. 327).

THE PATERNOSTER.

Introductory Note in which it is stated that—

"It is meet and much requisite that the unlearned people should use to make their prayers in their mother tongue" (p. 335).

On Petition 5 it is laid down that the exercise of the duty of forgiveness does not excuse the offender from making restitution, nor does it prevent the obstinate offender from being punished according to law (p. 349).

THE AVE MARIA.

In both books this is shown not to be a prayer, but a hymn of praise and thanks (1) to our Lord and Saviour, (2) to the B.V.M. also, for that the Incarnation took place by her consent.

(p. 208.)

(p. 358.)

THE ARTICLE OF FREE WILL.

Free will is thus defined:—

"In all men a certain power of the will joined with reason, whereby a reasonable creature without constraint in things of reason, discerneth and willeth good and evil: but it willeth not that good which is acceptable to God except it be holpen with grace" (p. 359).

BISHOPS' BOOK.	KING'S BOOK.
THE ARTICLE OF JUSTIFICATION.	
Christ's merits are the only sufficient and worthy cause. Faith is necessary on our part, and we, being justified, be necessarily bound to do good works. (p. 209.)	Justification is defined as "the making of us righteous afore God." God is the principal cause, but man "shall also walk in such works as be requisite to his justification." The effects of Christ's works are appropriated by faith, repentance, baptism, and penance. (p. 365, 366.)
	THE ARTICLE OF GOOD WORKS.
	Two kinds are distinguished—(i.) fruits of righteousness, which are meritorious towards the attaining of everlasting life; and (ii.) works of penance, by means of which men do enter into justification (p. 371).
THE ARTICLE OF PURGATORY.	OF PRAYER FOR SOULS DEPARTED.
In both books the locality and name of Purgatory, and the kind of pains endured by souls departed, are declared uncertain. Abuses advanced under the name of Purgatory are to be put away. Prayers, masses, and alms for the departed are defended.	

APPENDIX III

EXTRACTS FROM CONTEMPORARY LETTERS SHOWING THE CHANGE IN CRANMER'S OPINIONS

(1.) Traheron to Bullinger, dated London, August 1, 1548:—

"You must know that all our countrymen, who are sincerely favourable to the restoration of the truth, entertain in all respects like opinions with you. . . . I except *the Archbishop of Canterbury* and Latimer" (vol. i. p. 320).

(2.) John ab Ulmis to Bullinger, dated London, August 18, 1548:—

"*He* has lately published a Catechism, in which *he* has not only approved that foul and sacrilegious transubstantiation of the papists in the Holy Supper of our Saviour, but all the dreams of Luther seem to him sufficiently well-grounded, perspicuous, and lucid" (vol. ii. p. 381).

(3.) Traheron to Bullinger, dated London, September 28, 1548:—

"You must know that Latimer has come over to our opinion respecting the true doctrine of the Eucharist, together with *the Archbishop of Canterbury* and the other bishops who heretofore seemed to be Lutherans" (vol. i. p. 322).

(4.) John ab Ulmis to Bullinger, dated Oxford, November 27, 1548:—

"Even *that Thomas himself* about whom I wrote to you when I was in London, by the goodness of God and the instrumentality of that most upright and judicious man, master John a Lasco, is in a great measure recovered from his dangerous lethargy" (vol. ii. p. 383).

(5.) Traheron to Bullinger, dated London, December 31, 1548:—

"*The Archbishop of Canterbury*, contrary to general expectation, most openly, firmly, and learnedly maintained your opinion upon this subject" [the Eucharist] (vol. i. p. 323).

(6.) Wolfgang Musculus to Bullinger, dated Berne, March 12, 1549:—

"I have nothing more to write about *the Archbishop*, except that he is daily becoming more favourable to Evangelical truth" (vol. i. p. 337).

(7.) Hooper to Bullinger, dated London, December 27, 1549:—

"*The Archbishop of Canterbury* entertains right views as to the nature of Christ's presence in the Supper, and is now very friendly towards myself" (vol. i. p. 71).

(8.) Hooper to Bullinger, dated London, February 5, 1550:—

"But now, as I hope, master Bullinger and *Canterbury* entertain the same opinions" (vol. i. p. 77).

(9.) Peter Martyr to Bullinger, dated Oxford, June 1, 1550:—

"There are also very many of the nobility and men of rank who entertain right views; and we have some bishops who are not ill-inclined, among whom *the Archbishop of Canterbury* is as a standard-bearer" (vol. ii. p. 482).

(10.) Hooper to Bullinger, dated London, June 29, 1550:—

"*Canterbury* has relaxed much of his Lutheranism (whether all of it I cannot say): he is not so decided as I could wish, and dares not, I fear, assert his opinion in all respects" (vol. i. p. 89).

[*Note.*—The references are to the series of "Original Letters" published by the Parker Society.]

APPENDIX IV

TEXT OF ARTICLES I.–XV. AS REVISED BY THE WESTMINSTER "ASSEMBLY OF DIVINES," 1643

[Alterations and additions are printed in *italics;* an asterisk denotes that something has been omitted.]

ARTICLE I.

OF FAITH IN THE HOLY TRINITY.

THERE is but one living and true God, everlasting, without body, parts, or passions; of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness; the maker and preserver of all things, both visible and invisible. And in unity of this Godhead, there be three persons, of one substance, power, and eternity; the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

ARTICLE II.

OF THE WORD, OR SON OF GOD, WHICH WAS MADE VERY MAN.

The Son, which is the Word of the Father, begotten from everlasting of the Father, the very and eternal God, of one substance with the Father, took man's nature in the womb of the blessed Virgin, of her substance; so that two whole and perfect natures, that is to say, the Godhead and *the* manhood, were joined together in one person, never to be divided; whereof is one Christ, very God, and very man: who *for our sakes* truly suffered *most grievous torments in his soul from God;* was crucified, dead and buried, to reconcile his Father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for * actual sins of men.

[*Note.*—In the last line the word "all" has been omitted.]

ARTICLE III.

As Christ died for us, and was buried, so * it is to be believed that *he continued in the state of the dead, and under the power and*

dominion of death, from the time of his death and burial until his resurrection; which hath been otherwise expressed thus:—He went down into hell.

[*Note.*—"Also" is omitted in the first line.]

ARTICLE IV.

OF THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST.

Christ did truly rise again from death, and took again his body, with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature, wherewith he ascended into heaven, and there sitteth, until he return to judge all men, *at the general resurrection of the body*, at the last day.

ARTICLE V.

OF THE HOLY GHOST.

The Holy Ghost is very and eternal God, of one substance, majesty, and glory with the Father and the Son, proceeding from the Father and the Son.

[*Note.*—There is no alteration in the wording of this Article, but the order of the clauses is changed.]

ARTICLE VI.

OF THE SUFFICIENCY OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES FOR SALVATION.

Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be * believed as an article of * faith, or * necessary to salvation.

By the name of Holy Scripture we * understand *all the* Canonical books of the Old and New Testament * *which follow:*—

OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

Genesis, Exodus, etc.

* * *

OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

The Gospel of St. Matthew, etc.

All *which* books, as they are commonly received, we do receive,

and *acknowledge them to be given by the inspiration of God; and, in that regard, to be of most certain credit, and highest authority.*

[*Note.*—Of the many omissions here, two will be seen to be of special significance—(*a*) the omission of the definition of the Canonical books as those "of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church," and (*b*) the omission of any recognition of the Apocryphal books.]

ARTICLE VII.

OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

The Old Testament is not contrary to the New, *in the doctrine contained in them;* for both in the Old and New Testament, everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and man, being both God and man. Wherefore they are not to be heard, which feign that the old fathers did look only for *temporary* promises.

Although the law given from God by Moses, as touching ceremonies and rites, do not bind *Christians;* nor the civil precepts *given by Moses, such as were peculiarly fitted to the commonwealth of the Jews, are* of necessity to be received in any commonwealth; yet, notwithstanding, no Christian man whatsoever is free from the obedience of the commandments which are called moral. *By the moral law, we understand all the Ten Commandments taken in their full extent.*

ARTICLE VIII.

OF THE THREE CREEDS.

The Creeds *that go under the name of the* Nicene Creed, Athanasius' Creed, and that which is called the Apostles' Creed, *are* thoroughly to be received and believed, for that they may be proved by most certain warrant of Holy Scripture.

[*Note.*—In some copies of the Articles as revised by the Westminster Assembly this eighth Article is altogether omitted. It is found, however, in the form given above in a rare volume of tracts in the library of the British Museum—King's Pamphlets, E. 516; Mitchell's "Westminster Assembly," p. 157.]

ARTICLE IX.

OF ORIGINAL OR BIRTH SIN.

Original sin standeth not in the following of Adam, as the Pelagians do vainly talk; but *together with his first sin imputed,* it is the fault and corruption of the nature of every man that naturally is *propagated from* Adam: whereby man is *wholly deprived of* original righteousness, and is of his own nature inclined *only* to evil. So that the lust of the flesh, called in the Greek φρόνημα σαρκὸς, which some do expound the wisdom, some sensuality, some the affection, some the desire of the flesh, is not subject to the law of God; and therefore in every person born into this world, it deserveth God's wrath and damnation. And this infection of nature doth remain, yea, in them that are regenerate; whereby the flesh lusteth always contrary to the Spirit. And although there is no condemnation for them that are *regenerate* and *do* believe, yet the Apostle doth confess, that concupiscence and lust *is truly and properly* sin (*Rom. vii. 17, 20*).

[*Note.*—Several clauses of this Article are transposed.]

ARTICLE X.

OF FREE WILL.

The condition of man after the fall of Adam is such, that he cannot turn *or* prepare himself, by his own natural strength and good works, to faith and calling upon God: wherefore we have no power to do good works, *pleasing* and acceptable to God, without the grace of God by Christ *both* preventing us that we may have a good will, *and working so effectually in us as that it determineth our will to that which is good,* and *also* working with us when we have that *will unto good.*

ARTICLE XI.

OF THE JUSTIFICATION OF MAN *BEFORE GOD.*

We are justified, that is, we are accounted righteous before God, *and have remission of sins,* not for, *nor by,* our own works or deservings, *but freely by his grace,* only for our Lord and Saviour

Jesus Christ's *sake, his whole obedience and satisfaction being by God imputed unto us, and Christ, with his righteousness, being apprehended and rested on* by faith *only. The doctrine of justification* by faith only is a * wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort: * *notwithstanding God doth not forgive them that are impenitent, and go on still in their trespasses.*

[*Note.*—The order of some of the clauses is changed, and the reference to the Homily is, as we should expect, omitted.]

ARTICLE XII.

OF GOOD WORKS.

* Good works, which are the fruits of faith, and follow after justification, cannot put away our sins, and endure the severity of God's judgment; yet are they, *notwithstanding their imperfections in the sight of God,* pleasing and acceptable *unto him* in *and for* Christ, and do spring out necessarily of a true and lively faith, insomuch that by them a lively faith may be as evidently known, as a tree discerned by the *fruits.*

[*Note.*—"Albeit that" is omitted in the first line.]

ARTICLE XIII.

OF WORKS BEFORE JUSTIFICATION.

Works done before *justification by* Christ, and *regeneration by* his Spirit, are not *pleasing unto* God, forasmuch as they spring not of faith in Jesus Christ: neither do they make men meet to receive grace, or (as the school-authors say) deserve grace of congruity; yea, rather, for that they are not done as God hath willed and commanded them to be done,* *they are sinful.*

[*Note.*—"We doubt not but that" omitted in the last line.]

ARTICLE XIV.

OF WORKS OF SUPEREROGATION.

Voluntary works besides, over and above God's commandments, which they call works of supererogation, cannot be taught without arrogancy and impiety. For by them men do declare that they do not only render unto God as much as they are bound to do,

but that they do more for his sake than of bounden duty is required: whereas Christ saith plainly, "When ye have done all *those things* that are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants; *we have done that which was our duty to do*" (*Luke xvii. 10*).

ARTICLE XV.

OF CHRIST ALONE WITHOUT SIN.

Christ, in the truth of our nature, was made like unto us in all things, sin only excepted; from which he was clearly void, both in his flesh and in his spirit. He came to be the Lamb without spot, who, by sacrifice of himself once made, should take away the sins of the world: and sin (as St. John saith, *1 John iii. 5*) was not in him. But all we the rest, although baptized *and regenerate*, yet offend in many things; and if we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.

APPENDIX V

BISHOP GESTE'S LETTER ON ARTICLE XXVIII

GREETING IN YE LORD.

RIGHT HONOURABLE—I am verye sorye yt you are so sicke, God make make you whole, as it is my desyer and prayer. I wold have seen you er this, accordinge to my duetye and good will, but when I sent to knowe whether I might see you it was often answered yt you were not to be spoken with.

I suppose you have heard how ye Bisshop of Glocestre[1] found him selue greeved with ye plasynge of this adverbe onelye in this article, 'The Body of Christ is gyven taken and eaten in ye Supper after an heavenly and spirituall maner only' bycause it did take awaye ye presence of Christis Bodye in ye Sacrament, and privily noted me to take his part therein, and yeasterday in myn absence more playnely vouched me for ye same. Whereas betwene him and me, I told him playnely that this word onelye in ye foresaied Article did not exclude ye presence of Christis Body from the Sacrament, but only ye grossenes and sensiblenes in ye receavinge thereof: For I saied unto him though he tooke Christis Bodye in his hand, receaved it with his mouthe, and that corporally naturally reallye substantially and carnally as ye doctors doo write, yet did he not for all that see it, feale it, smell it, nor tast it. And therefore I told him I wolde speake against him herein, and ye rather bycause ye article was of myn own pennynge. And yet I wold not for all that denye thereby any thing that I had spoken for ye presence. And this was ye some of our talke.

And this that I saied is so true by all sortes of men that even D. Hardinge writeth ye same as it appeareth most evidently by his wordes reported in ye Busshoppe of Salisburie's booke pagina 325, wich be these: 'Then ye maye saye yt in ye Sacrament His verye Bodye is present, yea really that is to saye, in deede, substantially that is in substance, and corporally carnally and naturally, by ye wich words is ment that His verye Bodye His verye flesh and His verye human nature is there not after corporall carnall or naturall wise, but invisibly unspeakably supernaturally spiritually divinely and by waye unto Him only

[1] Richard Cheyney.

knowen.'[1] This I thought good to write to your honour for mine owne purgation. The Almighty God in Christ restore you to your old health, and longe kepe you in ye same with encrease of vertue and honour.

Yours whole to his poore pow^r

EDM. ROFFEN.

To ye right honourable and his singler good friend
Sir Willm. Cecil Knight Principall Secretaire
to ye Queens Ma^tie.

[1] This passage is quoted from Bishop Jewel's controversy with the Romanist Harding (v. § 5, p. 445, ed. Parker Society).

APPENDIX VI

THE IRISH ARTICLES OF 1615

In the compilation of these Articles those who sympathised with the Swiss school of Reformers were able to exert an influence which they had not been able effectually to exert upon the course of the English Reformation, or upon the text of the formularies of the English Church. The Irish Articles are therefore given here in full, because a comparison of them with our XXXIX. Articles is most instructive, exhibiting by contrast the truly Catholic character of our own formulary.

[*Note.*—Passages from the Lambeth Articles are printed in **thick type.** Passages from the XXXIX. Articles are printed in *italics.*]

ARTICLES OF RELIGION

Agreed upon by the Archbishops and Bishops, and the rest of the Clergy of Ireland, in the Convocation holden at Dublin in the year of our Lord God 1615, for the avoiding of Diversities of Opinions, and the establishing of Consent touching true Religion.

ARTICLE I.

OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURE AND THE THREE CREEDS.[1]

(1.) The ground of our religion, and the rule of faith and all saving truth, is the word of God, contained in the holy Scripture.

(2.) *By the name of holy Scripture we understand* all the *Canonical books of the Old and New Testament,* viz.:—

---

[1] *Cf.* VI. and VIII. of the XXXIX. Articles. On the significance of placing the Article on Holy Scripture first, see p. 48 above.

OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

The five Books of Moses.
Joshua.
Judges.
Ruth.
The 1st and 2nd of Samuel.
The 1st and 2nd of Kings.
The 1st and 2nd of Chronicles.
Ezra.
Nehemiah.
Esther.
Job.
Psalms.
Proverbs.
Ecclesiastes.
The Song of Solomon.
Isaiah.
Jeremiah, his Prophecy and Lamentations.
Ezekiel.
Daniel.
The twelve Less Prophets.

OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

The Gospels according to—
Matthew.
Mark.
Luke.
John.
The Acts of the Apostles.
The Epistle of Paul to the Romans.
Corinthians, two.
Galatians.
Ephesians.
Philippians.
Colossians.
Thessalonians, two.
Timothy, two.
Titus.
Philemon.
Hebrews.
The Epistle of St. James.
St. Peter, two.
St. John, three.
St. Jude.
The Revelation of St. John.

All which we acknowledge to be given by inspiration of God, and in that regard to be of most certain credit and highest authority.

(3.) *The other books,* commonly called Apocryphal, did not proceed from such inspiration, and therefore are not of sufficient authority *to establish any* point of *doctrine,* but *the Church doth read* them as books containing many worthy things, *for example of life, and instruction of manners.*

SUCH ARE THESE FOLLOWING.

The 3rd Book of Esdras.
The 4th Book of Esdras.
The Book of Tobias.
The Book of Judith.
Additions to the Book of Esther.
The Book of Wisdom.
The Book of Jesus, the Son of Sirach, called Ecclesiasticus.
Baruch, with the Epistle of Jeremiah.
The Song of the Three Children.
Sussannah.
Bell and the Dragon.
The Prayer of Manasses.
The 1st Book of Maccabees.
The 2nd Book of Maccabees.

(4.) The Scriptures ought to be translated out of the original tongues into all languages for the common use of all men: neither is any person to be discouraged from reading the Bible in such a language as he doth understand, but seriously exhorted to read the same with great humility and reverence, as a special means to bring him to the true knowledge of God, and of his own duty.

(5.) Although there be some hard things in the Scripture (especially such as have proper relation to the times in which they were first uttered, and prophecies of things which were afterwards to be fulfilled), yet all things necessary to be known unto everlasting salvation are clearly delivered therein; and nothing of that kind is spoken under dark mysteries in one place, which is not in other places spoken more familiarly and plainly, to the capacity both of learned and unlearned.

(6.) The *Holy Scriptures contain all things necessary to salvation*, and are able to instruct sufficiently in all points of faith that we are bound to believe, and all good duties that we are bound to practise.

(7.) All and every the Articles contained in the *Nicene Creed*, the *Creed* of *Athanasius, and that which is commonly called the Apostles' Creed, ought* firmly *to be received and believed*; *for they may be proved by most certain warrant of holy Scripture.*

ARTICLE II.

OF FAITH IN THE HOLY TRINITY.[1]

(8.) *There is but one living and true God, everlasting, without body, parts, or passions, of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness, the maker and preserver of all things, both visible and invisible. And in unity of this Godhead there be three persons, of one* and the same *substance, power, and eternity; the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.*

(9.) The essence of the Father doth not beget the essence of the Son; but the person of the Father begetteth the person of the Son, by communicating his whole essence to the person begotten from eternity.

(10.) *The Holy Ghost proceeding from the Father and the Son, is of one substance, majesty, and glory, with the Father and the Son, very and eternal God.*

[1] *Cf.* I., II., and V. of the XXXIX. ARTICLES.

ARTICLE III.

OF GOD'S ETERNAL DECREE AND PREDESTINATION.[1]

(11.) God, from all eternity, did, by his unchangeable counsel, ordain whatsoever in time should come to pass: yet so as thereby no violence is offered to the wills of the reasonable creatures, and neither the liberty nor the contingency of the second causes is taken away, but established rather.

(12.) By the same eternal counsel, **God hath predestinated some unto life, and reprobated some unto death:**[2] of both which there is a certain number, known only to God, **which can neither be increased nor diminished.**[3]

(13.) *Predestination to life is the everlasting purpose of God, whereby, before the foundations of the world were laid, he hath constantly decreed* in *his* secret counsel *to deliver from curse and damnation those whom he hath chosen in Christ out of mankind, and to bring them by Christ unto everlasting salvation, as vessels made to honour.*

(14.) **The cause moving God to predestinate unto life, is not the foreseeing of faith, or perseverance, or good works, or of anything which is in the person predestinated, but only the good pleasure of God himself.**[4] For all things being ordained for the manifestation of his glory, and his glory being to appear both in the works of his mercy and of his justice, it seemed good to his heavenly wisdom to choose out a certain number, towards whom he would extend his undeserved mercy, leaving the rest to be spectacles of his justice.

(15.) Such as are predestinated unto life, *be called according unto God's purpose (his Spirit working in due season)*, and *through grace they obey the calling, they be justified freely, they be made sons of God by adoption, they be made like the image of his only-begotten Son Jesus Christ, they walk religiously in good works, and at length by God's mercy they attain to everlasting felicity.* **But such as are not predestinated to salvation shall** finally **be condemned for their sins.**[5]

(16.) *The godly consideration of predestination and our election in Christ, is full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort to godly persons, and such as feel in themselves the working of the Spirit of*

[1] *Cf.* XVII. of the XXXIX. ARTICLES.
[2] The 1st of the LAMBETH ARTICLES.
[3] The 3rd of the LAMBETH ARTICLES.
[4] The 2nd of the LAMBETH ARTICLES.
[5] The 4th of the LAMBETH ARTICLES.

Christ, mortifying the works of the flesh, and their earthly members, and drawing up their minds to high and heavenly things: as well because it doth greatly confirm and establish their faith of eternal salvation to be enjoyed through Christ, as because it doth fervently kindle their love towards God. And, on the contrary side, *for curious and carnal persons lacking the Spirit of Christ, to have continually before their eyes the sentence of God's predestination is* very dangerous.

(17.) *We must receive God's promises in such wise as they be generally set forth* unto *us in holy Scripture: and in our doings, that will of God is to be followed which we have expressly declared unto us in the word of God.*

ARTICLE IV.

OF THE CREATION AND GOVERNMENT OF ALL THINGS.

(18.) In the beginning of time, when no creature had any being, God, by his word alone, in the space of six days, created all things, and afterwards by his providence doth continue, propagate, and order them according to his own will.

(19.) The principal creatures are angels and men.

(20.) Of angels, some continued in that holy state wherein they were created, and are, by God's grace, for ever established therein: others fell from the same, and are reserved in chains of darkness unto the judgment of the great day.

(21.) Man being at the beginning created according to the image of God, (which consisted especially in the wisdom of his mind, and the true holiness of his free-will,) had the covenant of the law engrafted in his heart; whereby God did promise unto him everlasting life, upon condition that he performed entire and perfect obedience unto his commandments, according to that measure of strength wherewith he was endued in his creation, and threatened death unto him if he did not perform the same.

ARTICLE V.

OF THE FALL OF MAN, ORIGINAL SIN, AND THE STATE OF MAN BEFORE JUSTIFICATION.[1]

(22.) By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death went over all men, forasmuch as all have sinned.

(23.) *Original sin standeth not in* imitation *of Adam* (*as the*

[1] *Cf.* IX., X., and XIII. of the XXXIX. ARTICLES.

Pelagians dream), *but is the fault and corruption of the nature of every* person *that naturally is engendered* and propagated from *Adam: whereby* it cometh to pass that *man is* deprived of *original righteousness, and* by *nature* is bent unto sin; *and therefore in every person born into* the *world, it deserveth God's wrath and damnation.*

(24.) *This* corruption *of nature doth remain even in those that are regenerated;* whereby the flesh always lusteth against the Spirit, and cannot be made *subject to the law of God.* And howsoever, for Christ's sake, there be *no condemnation* to such as are regenerate, and do *believe;* yet *doth the apostle acknowledge, that* in itself this *concupiscence hath the nature of sin* (Rom. vii. 14–17).

(25.) *The condition of man after the fall of Adam is such, that he cannot turn, and prepare himself, by his own natural strength and good works, to faith, and calling upon God. Wherefore we have no power to do good works, pleasing and acceptable unto God, without the grace of God preventing us, that we may have a good will, and working with us when we have that good will.*

(26.) *Works done before the grace of Christ and the inspiration of his Spirit, are not pleasing unto God, forasmuch as they spring not of faith in Jesus Christ; neither do they make men meet to receive grace, or (as the school-authors say) deserve grace of congruity: yea, rather, for that they are not done* in such sort *as God hath willed and commanded them to be done, we doubt not but they* are sinful.

(27.) All sins are not equal, but some far more heinous than others; yet the very least is of its own nature mortal, and, without God's mercy, maketh the offender liable unto everlasting damnation.

(28.) God is not the author of sin: howbeit he doth not only permit, but also by his providence govern and order the same, guiding it in such sort by his infinite wisdom, as it turneth to the manifestation of his own glory, and to the good of his elect.

ARTICLE VI.

OF CHRIST, THE MEDIATOR OF THE SECOND COVENANT.[1]

(29.) *The Son, which is the Word of the Father, begotten from everlasting of the Father,* the true *and eternal God, of one substance with the Father, took man's nature in the womb of the blessed Virgin,*

[1] *Cf.* II., XV., III., and IV. of the XXXIX. ARTICLES.

of her substance: so that two whole and perfect natures (that is to say, the Godhead and Manhood) were inseparably *joined in one person,* making *one Christ, very God and very man.*

(30.) *Christ, in the truth of our nature, was made like unto us in all things, sin only excepted, from which he was clearly void, both in his* life *and in his* nature. *He came* as a *lamb without spot,* to *take away the sins of the world by* the *sacrifice of himself once made; and sin (as St. John saith,* 1 John iii. 5) *was not in him.* He fulfilled the law for us perfectly: for our sakes he endured most grievous torments immediately in his soul, and most painful sufferings in his body. He *was crucified,* and died, *to reconcile his Father* unto *us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for all* our *actual* transgressions. He *was buried,* and *descended into hell;* and the third day rose from the dead, *and took again his body, with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature; wherewith he ascended into heaven, and there sitteth* at the right hand of his *Father, until he return to judge all men at the last day.*

ARTICLE VII.

OF THE COMMUNICATING OF THE GRACE OF CHRIST.[1]

(31.) They are to be condemned, *that presume to say, that every man shall be saved by the law or sect which he professeth, so that he be diligent to frame his life according to that law, and the light of nature. For holy Scripture doth set out unto us only the name of Jesus Christ whereby men must be saved.*

(32.) **None can come unto Christ unless it be given unto him, and unless the Father draw him. And all men are not so drawn by the Father, that they may come unto the Son;**[2] neither is there such a sufficient measure of grace vouchsafed unto every man, whereby he is enabled to come unto everlasting life.[3]

(33.) All God's elect are in their time inseparably united unto Christ by the effectual and vital influence of the Holy Ghost, derived from him, as from the head, unto every true member of his mystical body. And being thus made one with Christ, they are truly regenerated, and made partakers of him and all his benefits.

[1] *Cf.* XVIII. of the XXXIX. ARTICLES.
[2] The 8th of the LAMBETH ARTICLES.
[3] The 7th of the LAMBETH ARTICLES, but not quoted verbatim.

ARTICLE VIII.

OF JUSTIFICATION AND FAITH.[1]

(34.) *We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ,* applied *by faith; and not for our own works or* merits. And this righteousness, which we so receive of God's mercy and Christ's merits, embraced by faith, is taken, accepted, and allowed of God for our perfect and full justification.

(35.) Although this justification be free unto us, yet it cometh not so freely unto us, that there is no ransom paid therefore at all. God showed his great mercy in delivering us from our former captivity, without requiring of any ransom to be paid, or amends to be made, on our parts: which thing by us had been impossible to be done. And whereas all the world was not able of themselves to pay any part towards their ransom, it pleased our heavenly Father, of his infinite mercy, without any desert of ours, to provide for us the most precious merits of his own Son, whereby our ransom might be fully paid, the law fulfilled, and his justice fully satisfied. So that Christ is now the righteousness of all them that truly believe in him. He, for them, paid their ransom by his death; he, for them, fulfilled the law in his life: that now, in him, and by him, every true Christian man may be called a fulfiller of the law; forasmuch as that which our infirmity was not able to effect, Christ's justice hath performed. And thus the justice and mercy of God do embrace each other: the grace of God not shutting out the justice of God in the matter of our justification, but only shutting out the justice of man (that is to say, the justice of our own works) from being any cause of deserving our justification.

(36.) When we say that we are justified by faith only, we do not mean that the said justifying faith is alone in man, without true repentance, hope, charity, and the fear of God; (for such a faith is dead, and cannot justify:) neither do we mean that this our act to believe in Christ, or this our faith in Christ, which is within us, doth of itself justify us, or deserve our justification unto us; (for that were to account ourselves to be justified by the virtue or dignity of something that is within ourselves:) but the true understanding and meaning thereof is, that although we

[1] *Cf.* XI. of the XXXIX. ARTICLES.

hear God's word, and believe it; although we have faith, hope, charity, repentance, and the fear of God within us, and add never so many good works thereunto; yet we must renounce the merit of all our said virtues, of faith, hope, charity, and all our other virtues and good deeds, which we either have done, shall do, or can do, as things that be far too weak and imperfect, and insufficient to deserve remission of our sins, and our justification: and therefore we must trust only in God's mercy, and the merits of his most dearly beloved Son, our only Redeemer, Saviour, and Justifier, Jesus Christ. Nevertheless, because faith doth directly send us to Christ for our justification, and that by faith, given us of God, we embrace the promise of God's mercy, and the remission of our sins, (which thing none other of our virtues or works properly doth;) therefore the Scripture useth to say, that faith without works (and the ancient fathers of the Church, to the same purpose, that only faith) doth justify us.

(37.) By justifying faith, we understand not only the common belief of the articles of Christian religion, and a persuasion of the truth of God's word in general, but also a particular application of the gracious promises of the Gospel, to the comfort of our own souls; whereby we lay hold on Christ, with all his benefits, having an earnest trust and confidence in God, that he will be merciful unto us for his only Son's sake. So that **a true believer may be certain, by the assurance of faith, of the forgiveness of his sins, and of his everlasting salvation by Christ.**[1]

(38.) **A true, lively, justifying faith, and the sanctifying Spirit of God, is not extinguished, nor vanisheth away, in the regenerate, either finally or totally.**[2]

ARTICLE IX.

OF SANCTIFICATION AND GOOD WORKS.[3]

(39.) All that are justified, are likewise sanctified: their faith being always accompanied with true repentance and good works.

(40.) Repentance is a gift of God, whereby a godly sorrow is wrought in the heart of the faithful, for offending God, their merciful Father, by their former transgressions, together with a constant resolution for the time to come to cleave unto God, and to lead a new life.

[1] The 6th of the LAMBETH ARTICLES.
[2] The 5th of the LAMBETH ARTICLES.
[3] *Cf.* XII., XV., XVI., and XIV. of the XXXIX. ARTICLES.

(41.) *Albeit that good works, which are the fruits of faith, and follow after justification, cannot* make satisfaction for *our sins, and endure the severity of God's judgment; yet are they pleasing to God,* and accepted of him *in Christ, and do spring* from *a true and lively faith,* which *by them* is to be discerned, *as a tree by the fruit.*

(42.) The works which God would have his people to walk in, are such as he hath commanded in his holy Scripture, and not such works as men have devised out of their own brain, of a blind zeal and devotion, without the warrant of the word of God.

(43.) The regenerate cannot fulfil the law of God perfectly in this life. For *in many things we offend all: and if we say* that *we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.*

(44.) *Not every* heinous *sin, willingly committed after baptism, is sin against the Holy Ghost, and unpardonable.* And therefore *to such as fall into sin after baptism,* place for *repentance is not to be denied.*

(45.) *Voluntary works besides, over and above God's commandments, which they call works of supererogation, cannot be taught without arrogance and impiety. For by them men do declare that they do not only render unto God as much as they are bound to do, but that they do more for his sake than of bounden duty is required.*

ARTICLE X.

OF THE SERVICE OF GOD.

(46.) Our duty towards God is to believe in him, to fear him, and to love him with all our heart, with all our mind, with all our soul, and with all our strength, to worship him and to give him thanks, to put our whole trust in him, to call upon him, to honour his holy name and his word, and to serve him truly all the days of our life.[1]

(47.) In all our necessities we ought to have recourse unto God by prayer; assuring ourselves, that whatsoever we ask of the Father in the name of his Son, our only Mediator and Intercessor, Christ Jesus, and according to his will, he will undoubtedly grant it.

(48.) We ought to prepare our hearts before we pray, and understand the things that we ask when we pray: that both our hearts and voices may together sound in the ears of God's Majesty.

[1] *Cf.* CHURCH CATECHISM, the answer to the question, "What is thy duty towards God?"

(49.) When Almighty God smiteth us with affliction, or some great calamity hangeth over us, or any other weighty cause so requireth; it is our duty to humble ourselves in fasting, to bewail our sins with a sorrowful heart, and to addict ourselves to earnest prayer, that it might please God to turn his wrath from us, or supply us with such graces as we greatly stand in need of.

(50.) Fasting is a withholding of meat, drink, and all natural food, with other outward delights, from the body, for the determined time of fasting. As for those abstinences which are appointed by public order of our State, for eating of fish and forbearing of flesh at certain times and days appointed, they are no ways meant to be religious fasts, nor intended for the maintenance of any superstition in the choice of meats, but are grounded merely upon politic considerations, for provision of things tending to the better preservation of the commonwealth.

(51.) We must not fast with this persuasion of mind, that our fasting can bring us to heaven, or ascribe outward holiness to the work wrought. For God alloweth not our fast for the work's sake (which of itself is a thing merely indifferent), but chiefly respecteth the heart, how it is affected therein. It is therefore requisite, that first, before all things, we cleanse our hearts from sin, and then direct our fast to such ends as God will allow to be good: that the flesh may thereby be chastised, the spirit may be more fervent in prayer, and that our fasting may be a testimony of our humble submission to God's Majesty, when we acknowledge our sins unto him, and are inwardly touched with sorrowfulness of heart, bewailing the same in the affliction of our bodies.

(52.) All worship devised by man's fantasy, besides or contrary to the Scriptures (as wandering on pilgrimages, setting up of candles, stations and jubilees, pharisaical sects and feigned religions, praying upon beads, and such-like superstitions), hath not only no promise of reward in Scripture, but contrariwise threatenings and maledictions.

(53.) All manner of expressing God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, in an outward form, is utterly unlawful; as also all other images devised or made by man to the use of religion.

(54.) All religious worship ought to be given to God alone: from whom all goodness, health, and grace ought to be both asked and looked for, as from the very author and giver of the same, and from none other.

(55.) The name of God is to be used with all reverence and holy respect: and therefore all *vain and rash swearing* is utterly to be condemned. Yet notwithstanding, upon lawful occasions, an oath may be given, and taken, according to the word of God, *in justice, judgment, and truth.*[1]

(56.) The first day of the week, which is the Lord's day, is wholly to be dedicated to the service of God: and therefore we are bound therein to rest from our common and daily business, and to bestow that leisure upon holy exercises, both public and private.

ARTICLE XI.

OF THE CIVIL MAGISTRATE.[2]

(57.) *The king's majesty*, under God, *hath the* sovereign and *chief power*, within his *realms and dominions*, over all manner of persons, of what estate, either *ecclesiastical or civil*, soever they be; so as no other foreign power hath or ought to have any superiority over them.

(58.) We do profess that the supreme *government of all estates* within the said *realms* and dominions, *in all causes*, as well *ecclesiastical* as temporal, *doth* of right *appertain* to the king's highness. *Neither do we give* unto him hereby *the administration of the word* and *Sacraments*, or the power of the keys: *but that prerogative only, which we see to have been always given* unto *all godly princes in holy Scripture by God himself; that is, that* he *should* contain *all estates and degrees committed to* his *charge by God, whether they be ecclesiastical or* civil, within their duty, *and restrain the stubborn and evildoers with* the power of *the civil sword.*

(59.) The Pope, neither of himself, nor by any authority of the Church or See of Rome, or by any other means, with any other, hath any power or authority to depose the king, or dispose of any of his kingdoms or dominions, or to authorise any other prince to invade or annoy him or his countries, or to discharge any of his subjects of their allegiance and obedience to his majesty, or to give license or leave to any of them to bear arms, raise tumult, or to offer any violence or hurt to his royal person, state, or government, or to any of his subjects within his majesty's dominions.

[1] *Cf.* XXXIX. of the XXXIX. Articles.
[2] *Cf.* XXXVII. of the XXXIX. Articles.

(60.) That princes which be excommunicated or deprived by the Pope, may be deposed or murdered by their subjects, or any other whatsoever, is impious doctrine.

(61.) *The laws of the realm may punish Christian men with death for heinous and grievous offences.*

(62.) *It is lawful for Christian men, at the commandment of the magistrate,* to bear arms, *and* to *serve in* just *wars.*

ARTICLE XII.

OF OUR DUTY TOWARDS OUR NEIGHBOURS.[1]

(63.) Our duty towards our neighbours is to love them as ourselves, and to do to all men as we would they should do to us; to honour and obey our superiors; to preserve the safety of men's persons, as also their chastity, goods, and good names; to bear no malice nor hatred in our hearts; to keep our bodies in temperance, soberness, and chastity; to be true and just in all our doings; not to covet other men's goods, but to labour truly to get our own living, and to do our duty in that estate of life unto which it pleaseth God to call us.[2]

(64.) For the preservation of the chastity of men's persons, wedlock is commanded unto all men that stand in need thereof. Neither is there any prohibition by the Word of God, but that the ministers of the Church may enter into the state of matrimony: they being nowhere commanded by God's law, *either to vow the estate of single life, or* to *abstain from marriage, as they shall judge the same to serve better to godliness.*

(65.) *The riches and goods of Christians are not common, as touching the right, title, and possession of the same, as certain Anabaptists falsely* affirm.

(66.) *Notwithstanding every man ought of such things as he possesseth, liberally to give alms to the poor according to his ability.*

(67.) Faith given is to be kept even with heretics and infidels. The popish doctrine of equivocation and mental reservation, is most ungodly, and tendeth plainly to the subversion of all human society.

[1] *Cf.* XXXII. and XXXVIII. of the XXXIX. ARTICLES.

[2] *Cf.* CHURCH CATECHISM, the answer to the question, "What is thy duty towards thy Neighbour?"

ARTICLE XIII.

OF THE CHURCH, AND OUTWARD MINISTRY OF THE GOSPEL.[1]

(68.) There is but one Catholic Church, out of which there is no salvation ; containing the universal company of all the saints that ever were, are, or shall be gathered together in one body, under one head, Christ Jesus: part whereof is already in heaven triumphant, part as yet militant here upon earth. And because this Church consisteth of all those, and those alone, which are elected by God unto salvation, and regenerated by the power of his Spirit, (the number of whom is known only unto God himself,) therefore it is called the Catholic or universal, and the invisible Church.

(69.) But particular and visible Churches (consisting of those who make profession of the faith of Christ, and live under the outward means of salvation) be many in number: wherein the more or less sincerely, according to Christ's institution, the *word of God* is taught, *the Sacraments are administered*, and the authority of the keys is used, the more or less pure are such Churches to be accounted.

(70.) *Although in the visible Church the evil be ever mingled with the good, and sometimes the evil have chief authority in the ministration of the word and Sacraments; yet, forasmuch as they do not the same in their own name, but in Christ's, and minister by his commission and authority, we may use their ministry, both in hearing the word and in the receiving the Sacraments. Neither is the effect of Christ's ordinance taken away by their wickedness; nor the grace of God's gifts diminished from such as by faith and rightly do receive the Sacraments ministered unto them: which* are *effectual because of Christ's institution and promise, although they be ministered by evil men. Nevertheless it appertaineth to the discipline of the Church, that enquiry be made of evil ministers, and that they be accused by those that have knowledge of their offences, and finally, being found guilty, by just judgment be deposed.*

(71.) *It is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of public preaching, or ministering the Sacraments* of the Church, unless *he be* first *lawfully called and sent to execute the same. And those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work by men who have public authority given*

[1] *Cf.* XIX., XXVI., XXIII., XXIV., and XXXIII. of the XXXIX. ARTICLES.

them in the Church, *to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard.*

(72.) *To have public prayer in the Church, or to* administer *the Sacraments, in a tongue not understood of the people, is a thing plainly repugnant to the word of God, and the custom of the primitive Church.*

(73.) *That person which, by* public *denunciation of the Church, is rightly cut off from the unity of the Church, and excommunicate, ought to be taken of the whole multitude of the faithful as a heathen and publican; until by* repentance *he be openly reconciled, and received into the Church, by* the judgment of such as have *authority* in that behalf.

(74.) God hath given power to his ministers, not simply to forgive sins, (which prerogative he hath reserved only to himself;) but in his name to declare and pronounce unto such as truly repent, and unfeignedly believe his holy Gospel, the absolution and forgiveness of sins.[1] Neither is it God's pleasure that his people should be tied to make a particular confession of all their known sins unto any mortal man: howsoever, any person grieved in his conscience, upon any special cause, may well resort unto any godly and learned minister, to receive advice and comfort at his hands.[2]

ARTICLE XIV.

OF THE AUTHORITY OF THE CHURCH, GENERAL COUNCILS, AND BISHOP OF ROME.[3]

(75.) *It is not lawful for the Church to ordain anything that is contrary to God's word: neither may it so expound one place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to another. Wherefore, although the Church be a witness, and a keeper of holy writ; yet, as it ought not to decree anything against the same, so besides the same ought it not to enforce anything to be believed* upon *necessity of salvation.*

(76.) *General Councils may not be gathered together without the commandment and will of princes; and when they be gathered together,* (*forasmuch as they be an assembly of men* not always *governed with the Spirit and word of God,*) *they may err, and*

[1] *Cf.* the wording of the 'Absolution' in Morning and Evening Prayer.

[2] Contrast the concluding part of the first long Exhortation in the Communion Service.

[3] *Cf.* XX., XXI., XXXIV., XIX., and XXXVII. of the XXXIX. ARTICLES.

sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining to the rule of piety. *Wherefore things ordained by them, as necessary to salvation, have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be* shewed *that they be taken out of holy Scriptures.*

(77.) *Every particular Church hath authority* to institute, *to change*, and clean to put away *ceremonies* and other ecclesiastical rites, as they be superfluous, or be abused; and to constitute other, making more to seemliness, to order, or edification.

(78.) *As the Churches of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch have erred; so also the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in* those things which concern matter of practice and point of *ceremonies, but also in matters of faith.*

(79.) The power which the Bishop of Rome now challengeth, to be the supreme head of the universal Church of Christ, and to be above all emperors, kings, and princes, is an usurped power, contrary to the Scriptures and word of God, and contrary to the example of the primitive Church: and therefore it is for most just causes taken away and abolished within the king's majesty's realms and dominions.

(80.) The Bishop of Rome is so far from being the supreme head of the universal Church, that his works and doctrine do plainly discover him to be that man of sin, foretold in the holy Scriptures, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and abolish with the brightness of his coming.

ARTICLE XV.

OF THE STATE OF THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT.[1]

(81.) In the Old Testament the commandments of the law were more largely, and the promises of Christ more sparingly and darkly propounded; shadowed with a multitude of types and figures, and so much the more generally and obscurely delivered, as the manifesting of them was further off.

(82.) *The Old Testament is not contrary to the New. For both in the Old and New Testament everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and man, being both God and man. Wherefore they are not to be heard, which feign that the old fathers did look only for transitory promises.* For they looked for all benefits of God the Father, through the

[1] *Cf.* VII. of the XXXIX. ARTICLES.

merits of his Son Jesus Christ, as we now do: only they believed in Christ which should come, we in Christ already come.

(83.) The New Testament is full of grace and truth, bringing joyful tidings unto mankind, that whatsoever formerly was promised of Christ, is now accomplished; and so, instead of the ancient types and ceremonies, exhibiteth the things themselves, with a large and clear declaration of all the benefits of the Gospel. Neither is the ministry thereof restrained any longer to one circumcised nation, but is indifferently propounded unto all people, whether they be Jews or Gentiles. So that there is now no nation which can truly complain that they be shut forth from the communion of saints and the liberties of the people of God.

(84.) *Although the law given from God by Moses, as touching ceremonies and rites* be abolished, and *the civil precepts thereof be not of necessity to be received in any commonwealth; yet notwithstanding, no Christian man whatsoever is freed from the obedience of the commandments which are called moral.*

ARTICLE XVI.

OF THE SACRAMENTS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.[1]

(85.) The *Sacraments ordained* by *Christ be not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession; but rather certain sure witnesses, and effectual* or powerful *signs, of grace and God's goodwill towards us, by which he doth work invisibly in us, and not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in him.*

(86.) *There* be *two Sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel; that is to say, Baptism and the Lord's Supper.*

(87.) *Those five* which by the Church of Rome are *called Sacraments* (to wit, *Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction*) *are not to be accounted Sacraments of the Gospel; being such as have partly grown* from *corrupt* imitation *of the apostles, partly are states of life allowed in the Scriptures, but yet have not like nature of Sacraments with Baptism and the Lord's Supper, for that they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God,* together with a promise of saving grace annexed thereunto.

(8.) *The Sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed*

[1] *Cf.* XXV. of the XXXIX. ARTICLES.

upon, or to be carried about; but that we should duly use them. And in such only as worthily receive the same, they have a wholesome effect and *operation; but they that receive them unworthily,* thereby draw judgment upon *themselves.*

ARTICLE XVII.

OF BAPTISM.[1]

(89.) *Baptism is not only an* outward *sign of* our *profession, and a* note *of difference, whereby Christians are discerned from* such as are no Christians; but much more a Sacrament of our admission into the Church, sealing unto us our new birth (and consequently our justification, adoption, and sanctification) by the communion which we have with Jesus Christ.

(90.) *The Baptism of infants is to be retained in the Church,* as agreeable to the word of God.

(91.) In the administration of Baptism, exorcism, oil, salt, spittle, and superstitious hallowing of the water, are for just causes abolished: and without them the Sacrament is fully and perfectly administered, to all intents and purposes, agreeable to the institution of our Saviour Christ.

ARTICLE XVIII.

OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.[2]

(92.) *The Lord's Supper is not only a sign of the* mutual *love which Christians ought to* bear *one towards another, but* much more *a Sacrament of our* preservation in the Church, sealing unto us our spiritual nourishment and continual growth in Christ.

(93.) *The change of the substance of bread and wine* into the substance of the body and blood of Christ, commonly called *Transubstantiation, cannot be proved by holy writ, but is repugnant to plain* testimonies *of* the *Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to* most gross idolatry and manifold *superstitions.*

(94.) In the outward part of the holy Communion, the body and blood of Christ is in a most lively manner represented; being no otherwise present with the visible elements than things signi-

[1] *Cf.* XXVII. of the XXXIX. ARTICLES.
[2] *Cf.* XXVIII., XXIX., XXX., and XXXI. of the XXXIX. ARTICLES.

fied and sealed are present with the signs and seals, that is to say, symbolically and relatively. But in the inward and spiritual part, the same body and blood is really and substantially presented unto all those who have grace to receive the Son of God, even to all those that believe in his name. And unto such as in this manner do worthily and with faith repair unto the Lord's table, the body and blood of Christ is not only signified and offered, but also truly exhibited and communicated.

(95.) *The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the* Lord's *Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner; and the mean whereby the body of Christ is* thus *received and eaten, is faith.*

(96.) *The wicked, and such as* want *a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly* (*as S. Augustine* speaketh) *press with their teeth the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ; yet in no wise are they* made *partakers of Christ; but rather to their condemnation do eat and drink the sign or Sacrament of so great a thing.*

(97.) Both the parts of the Lord's Sacrament, according to Christ's institution, and the practice of the ancient Church, ought to be ministered unto all God's people; and it is plain sacrilege to rob them of the mystical cup, for whom Christ hath shed his most precious blood.

(98.) *The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped.*

(99.) The sacrifice of the mass, wherein the priest is said *to offer* up *Christ* for obtaining the *remission of pain* and *guilt for the quick and the dead*, is neither agreeable to Christ's ordinance, nor grounded upon doctrine apostolic; but contrariwise most ungodly, and most injurious to that all-sufficient sacrifice of our Saviour Christ, offered once for ever upon the Cross, which is the only propitiation and satisfaction for all our sins.

(100.) Private mass, that is, the receiving of the Eucharist by the priest alone, without a competent number of communicants, is contrary to the institution of Christ.

ARTICLE XIX.

OF THE STATE OF THE SOULS OF MEN, AFTER THEY BE DEPARTED OUT OF THIS LIFE; TOGETHER WITH THE GENERAL RESURRECTION, AND THE LAST JUDGMENT.

(101.) After this life is ended, the souls of God's children be presently received into heaven, there to enjoy unspeakable com-

forts; the souls of the wicked are cast into hell, there to endure endless torments.

(102.) *The doctrine* of the Church of Rome *concerning* limbus patrum, limbus puerorum, *purgatory*, prayer for the dead, *pardons, adoration of images and relics, and also invocation of saints, is vainly invented* without all warrant of holy Scripture, yea, and is contrary to the same.[1]

(103.) At the end of this world, the Lord Jesus shall come in the clouds with the glory of his Father: at which time, by the almighty power of God, the living shall be changed, and the dead shall be raised; and all shall appear both in body and soul before his judgment-seat, to receive according to that which they have done in their bodies, whether good or evil.

(104.) When the last judgment is finished, Christ shall deliver up the kingdom to his Father, and God shall be all in all.

THE DECREE OF THE SYNOD.

If any minister, of what degree or quality soever he be, shall publicly teach any doctrine contrary to these Articles agreed upon; if after due admonition he do not conform himself, and cease to disturb the peace of the Church, let him be silenced, and deprived of all spiritual promotions he doth enjoy.

[1] *Cf.* XXII. of the XXXIX. ARTICLES.

APPENDIX VII

TRANSLATION OF PASSAGES QUOTED FROM DOCUMENTS AND FORMULARIES OF FAITH

ARTICLE II.

Page 30.

Reformatio Legum, "De Haeresibus," Cap. 5 :—

"With regard to the twofold nature of Christ there is dangerous and varied error; some of them are of the sect of the Arians, laying it down that Christ is man in such a way as to deny that He is God. Others so judge Him to be God as not to recognise that He is man, and talk nonsense with respect to His body, as though it were divinely assumed from heaven, and descended into the Virgin's womb, and that in its passage through Mary, it passed as it were through a channel or tube."

Page 33.

Second Helvetic Confession, Art. XI. :—

"Further, by His passion and death, and by all the things which, by His advent in the flesh, He did and suffered for our sake, our Lord reconciled the Father in heaven to all believers."

ARTICLE V.

Page 45.

Orthodox Confession [of the Eastern Church] :—

"The Church teaches how the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father alone as the fount and source of the Godhead."

ARTICLE VI.

Page 47.

Tetrapolitan Confession, Cap. 1 :—

"We commanded those who amongst us exercised the office of preaching that they should teach from the pulpit nothing else than what is contained in the sacred Scriptures, or may be certainly proved thereby."

French Confession, Art. V.:—

"And since this is the sum of all truth, containing all that is requisite for the worship of God, and for our salvation; we declare that it is not lawful for men, nor even for angels themselves, to add anything to that Word, or to take away anything from it, or to alter anything at all in the same."

Scotch Confession, Art. XIX.:—

"We believe and confess that the Scriptures of God are sufficient to instruct, and make perfect, the man of God."

Belgic Confession, Art. VII.:—

"We believe also that this Holy Scripture does most perfectly contain all the will of God, and that therein all those things whatsoever are abundantly taught, which must be believed by men that they may attain salvation."

Page 48.

Second Helvetic Confession, Art. I.:—

"And in this Holy Scripture the universal Church of Christ has all things most fully expounded, such as pertain both to a saving faith, as well as to the due framing of a life pleasing to God. And in this respect it is expressly commanded by God, that nothing should be either added to, or taken from, the same."

Council of Trent, Session IV.:—

"The synod . . . perceiving that this truth and discipline are contained in the written books, and the unwritten traditions, which, received by the Apostles from the mouth of Christ Himself, or from the Apostles themselves at the dictation of the Holy Spirit, have come down even to us, transmitted as it were from hand to hand: the synod, following the examples of the orthodox fathers, receives and venerates, with equal affection of piety and reverence, all the books both of the Old and New Testament, since one God is the author of both, as also the said traditions, as well those appertaining to faith as to morals, as having been dictated either by Christ's own word of mouth, or by the Holy Spirit, and preserved by a continuous succession in the Catholic Church."

Orthodox Confession [of the Eastern Church]:—

"It is evident how the several parts of the Faith have their validity and sanction, partly from Holy Scripture, and partly from ecclesiastical tradition. . . . There are, therefore, two oracles of doctrines; some Scripture hands down, namely, such as are contained in the Divine

books of Holy Scripture, and some are doctrines handed down by word of mouth by the Apostles, and these have been interpreted by the Councils and the Holy Fathers; and on these two the Faith is founded."

Calvin's Institutes, I. ix. 1:—

"For there have lately arisen certain unsteady persons, who, most haughtily professing to be taught by the Spirit, themselves reject all reading, and deride the simplicity of those who still attend to (what they themselves call) the letter that is dead, and that killeth."

Page 50.

Ibid., I. vii. 1:—

"But there has generally prevailed a most dangerous error, viz., that Scripture has only so much weight as is conceded to it by the suffrages of the Church, as though the eternal and inviolable truth of God depended upon the choice of men."

Ibid., I. vii. 5:—

"Let this, therefore, remain decided, that they whom the Holy Spirit has inwardly taught entirely acquiesce in the Scripture, and that it is self-authenticated, neither is it right that it should be made a subject of proof and reasoning; but the certitude which it deserves with us it obtains by the testimony of the Spirit."

French Confession, Art. IV.:—

"We acknowledge these books to be Canonical; *i.e.*, we account them as the norm and rule of our faith, and that not only by the common consent of the Church, but also much more by the testimony and inward persuasion of the Holy Spirit, by whose intimation we are taught to discern those books from other Ecclesiastical books."

Page 51.

Scotch Confession, Art. XIX.:—

"We assert, therefore, that those who say that the Scripture has no other authority than that which it has received from the Church are blasphemers against God, and injurious to the true Church."

Belgic Confession, Art. V.:—

"These books alone we receive as sacred and Canonical, whereupon our faith may rest, and whereby it may be confirmed and established. And we believe without any doubt all those things which are contained in them, and that not so much because the Church receives and sanctions them as Canonical, as because the Holy Spirit bears witness to our consciences that they came forth from God, and most of all because they

themselves, by themselves, bear witness to and sanction this their own sacred authority and sanctity."

Second Helvetic Confession, Art. I. :—

"We believe and confess that the Canonical Scriptures of the holy prophets and apostles, of both Testaments, are the very true Word of God, and that they have sufficient authority of themselves, not from men. For God Himself spake to the fathers by the prophets and apostles, and still speaks to us through the Holy Scriptures."

Page 52.

S. Jerome, Preface to the Books of Solomon :—

"As, therefore, the Church indeed reads Judith, and Tobias, and the Maccabees, but does not receive them amongst the Canonical Scriptures, so also she reads these two volumes for edification of the people, not for establishing the authority of Ecclesiastical doctrines."

ARTICLE VII.

Page 53.

Reformatio Legum, "De Haeresibus," Cap. 4 :—

"Many are found in our own time, amongst whom the Anabaptists are especially to be reckoned, who, if any one quote the Old Testament to them, regard it as now abrogated and altogether obsolete, referring all things that are commanded therein to the ancient times of our forefathers. Therefore they determine that none of those things ought to apply to us."

Page 54.

Calvin's Institutes, II. x. 1 :—

"Moreover, what otherwise would be very useful, the monstrous scamp Servetus and some madmen of the sect of the Anabaptists have rendered necessary for us, who think no otherwise of the people Israel than of a herd of swine, whom they pretend to have been pampered by the Lord in this world, without any hope of immortality in heaven."

ARTICLE IX.

Page 71.

Reformatio Legum, "De Haeresibus," Cap. 7 :—

"In regard to the stain of sin, contracted from our birth, which we call Original Sin, in the first place the error of the Pelagians, and next

that of the Anabaptists, must be avoided and got rid of by us. In this matter they agree in stating, against Scriptural truth, that Original Sin affected Adam only, and did not pass over to his posterity, and that it does not affect our nature with any wrong disposition, except that, owing to the fault of Adam, there is set forth a harmful example of sinning, which leads men to imitate and acquire the same iniquity."

Page 72.

Belgic Confession, Art. XV. :—

"Original Sin is the corruption of the whole nature, and hereditary fault, with which even infants themselves are defiled in their mother's womb."

Calvin's Institutes, II. i. 8 :—

"And therefore infants themselves also, as they bring their own condemnation into the world with them, are guilty by their very own fault, not by that of another."

. . . . . .

"Original Sin therefore appears to be an hereditary depravity and corruption of our nature, diffused through all parts of the soul, which first makes us subject to God's wrath, and then produces works in us which Scripture calls works of the flesh."

Council of Trent, Session V. :—

"If any one asserts that the transgression of Adam injured himself alone, and not his posterity; and that the holiness and righteousness received from God, which he lost, he lost for himself alone, and not for us also; or that he, defiled by the sin of disobedience, has only transfused death and pains of the body unto the whole human race, but not sin also, which is the death of the soul; let him be anathema."

Page 73.

Formula of Concord :—

"It is the loss of original righteousness, with which man was created in Paradise, or of the image of God, after which man had been created at the beginning in truth, holiness, and righteousness."

French Confession, Art. IX. :—

"So that his own nature is wholly corrupt, and being blinded in spirit and depraved in heart, he has lost, without any exception whatever, all that integrity. For although he has some discernment of good and evil, nevertheless we affirm that whatsoever he has of light soon becomes darkness when the question is that of seeking God, so that by his own understanding and reason he can in no way approach to Him."

Scotch Confession, Art. III. :—

"By which transgression, commonly called Original Sin, that image of God in man is wholly defaced."

Page 74.

Augsburg Confession, Part I. Art. II. :—

"They teach . . . that this disease, or fault of birth, is truly sin, condemning and bringing now also eternal death to those who are not regenerated by Baptism and the Holy Spirit."

Second Helvetic Confession, Art. VIII. :—

"By our own desert we are subject to the wrath of God, and liable to just punishment; and so we should all be cast away from God, unless Christ our deliverer had brought us back. By death, therefore, we understand not merely bodily death, which must be undergone once by us all on account of sins, but also the everlasting punishments due to our sins and corruption."

Page 75.

XIII. Articles, Art. VI. :—

"But because infants are born with Original Sin, they have need of remission of that sin, and it is so remitted that the guilt is taken away, although the corruption of nature, or concupiscence, remains in this life, although it begins to be healed because the Holy Spirit works even in infants themselves and cleanses them."

Calvin's Institutes, IV. xv. 11 :—

"Baptism indeed promises us the drowning of our Pharaoh, and the mortification of sin, yet not in such a way that it no longer exists, or that it gives us no further trouble; but only that it may not overcome us. For as long as we live enclosed in this prison of our body, the remnants of sin will dwell in us; but if we hold in faith to the promise given to us by God in Baptism, they shall not rule or reign over us."

Melanchthon, "Loci Theologici," p. 112 :—

"So we thus answer that in Baptism sin is taken away as far as the guilt, or imputation, thereof is concerned, but the disease itself remains."

Page 76.

Saxon Confession, Art. II. :—

"We declare that this evil concupiscence is sin."

French Confession, Art. XI. :—

"We affirm also that this fault, even after Baptism, is truly sin."

Council of Trent, Session V. :—

"If any one denies that, by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is conferred in Baptism, the guilt of Original Sin is remitted, or asserts also that all that which has the true and proper nature of sin is not taken away, but says that it is only erased or not imputed, let him be anathema; for in those who are born again God hates nothing. . . . But the holy synod confesses and perceives that in the baptized there remains concupiscence, or an incentive to sin, which, since it is left for us to strive against, cannot injure those who refuse to consent to it, but successfully resist it through the grace of Christ. This concupiscence, which the Apostle sometimes calls sin, the holy synod declares that the Catholic Church has never understood to be called sin because in the regenerate it is truly and properly sin, but because it is of sin, and inclines to sin."

ARTICLE X.

Page 79.

Reformatio Legum, "De Haeresibus," Cap. 7 :—

"We must oppose those who attribute so much strength and force to free-will, as to lay down that by it alone, without any special grace of Christ, a right life may be lived by man."

Augsburg Confession, Part I. Art. XVIII. :—

"Concerning free-will they teach that the will of man has some freedom for performing civil righteousness, and for making choice of things within the reach of reason. But without the Holy Spirit it has no power of performing the righteousness of God, or spiritual righteousness, because the natural man perceiveth not the things of the Spirit of God."

Page 80.

Saxon Confession, Art. V. :—

"But man, by his natural strength, is by no means able to free himself from sin and eternal death; but this liberation and conversion of man to God and spiritual newness is wrought by the Son of God quickening us by His Holy Spirit."

French Confession, Art. IX. :—

"Further, although he be endowed with will, whereby he is moved to this or that, yet, since it is altogether captive under sin, it has no liberty whatever to desire good, save such as it has received by grace and by the gift of God."

Second Helvetic Confession, Art. IX. :—

"Man's understanding was not, indeed, taken from him, nor was he deprived of will and altogether changed into a stone or stock; nevertheless these things have been so altered and weakened in man that they are no more able to do that which they could before the Fall. For his understanding is darkened, whilst his will from being free has become an enslaved will."

Council of Trent, Session VI. :—

"The synod declares . . . that it behoves each one to recognise and confess, that whereas all men had lost their innocence in the transgression of Adam, having become unclean . . . were so far the slaves of sin . . . although in them the power of free choice, however weakened and biassed in its powers, was by no means extinguished."

Page 81.

Augsburg Confession, Part I. Art. XVIII. :—

"They condemn the Pelagians and others who teach that, without the Holy Spirit, by our natural powers alone, we are able to love God above all things, and also to keep the commandments of God, so far as the substance of our actions is concerned."

ARTICLE XI.

Page 83.

Wurtemburg Confession, Art. V. :—

"For man is accepted by God, and is accounted righteous before Him for the sake of the only Son of God, our Lord Jesus Christ, by faith."

Page 85.

Council of Trent, Session VI. :—

"Justification is not only remission of sins, but also sanctification and renewal of the inward man, by voluntary reception of the grace and gifts of God, whereby man from being unrighteous becomes righteous, and from being an enemy becomes a friend, so as to be an heir according to the hope of eternal life . . . The righteousness of God, whereby He makes us righteous, *i.e.*, upon being endued with which by Him, we are renewed in the spirit of our mind, and are not only accounted, but are called, and actually are, truly righteous, when we receive righteousness in ourselves."

Augsburg Confession, Part I. Art. IV. :—

"They teach also that men cannot be justified before God by their own strength, deserts, or works, but are freely justified for Christ's sake, by faith, when they believe that they are received into grace, and that their sins are remitted for Christ's sake, Who by His death made satisfaction for our sins. This faith God imputes for righteousness before Him."

Confessio Variata, Art. "De Fide":—

"When, therefore, we say that we are justified by faith, we do not mean that we are righteous on account of the dignity of that virtue itself, but this is the meaning:—that we obtain remission of our sins, and the imputation of righteousness, by God's mercy, for Christ's sake."

Saxon Confession, Art. III. :—

"When the mind is raised by this faith it is certain that remission of sins, reconciliation, and imputation of righteousness are given, for the sake of the merit of Christ Himself."

Page 85.

Formula of Concord:—

"The word 'justification' in this connection signifies the pronouncing righteous, the absolving from sins, and from the eternal punishment of sins, for the sake of Christ's righteousness, which is imputed by God to faith."

Calvin's Institutes, III. xi. 2 :—

"So we simply interpret justification as the acceptance with which God regards us as righteous, who have been received into grace; and we say that it consists in remission of sins, and the imputation of the righteousness of Christ."

Page 86.

French Confession, Art. XVIII. :—

"We believe that our whole righteousness consists in the remission of our sins, which is also, as David testifies, our only felicity. Therefore we wholly reject all other grounds whereupon men think that they can be justified before God; and casting away all thought of virtues and merits, we do altogether acquiesce in the sole obedience of Jesus Christ, which indeed is imputed to us, both that all our sins may be covered, and also that we may obtain favour before God."

Second Helvetic Confession, Art. XV. :—

"Properly speaking, therefore, God alone justifies us, and . . . justifies only for Christ's sake, by not imputing sins to us, but imputing to us His righteousness. . . . Therefore we teach and believe, with the Apostle, that sinful man is justified only by faith in Christ, not by the Law, or by any works."

XIII. Articles, Art. IV. :—

"Further with regard to justification, we teach that it properly signifies remission of sins, and our acceptance or reconciliation into grace and favour with God; *i.e.*, true renewal in Christ."

ARTICLE XII.

Page 88.

Wurtemburg Confession, Art. VII. :—

"But we must not think that, before God's judgment-seat, when the question is of expiating sin, and appeasing Divine wrath, and deserving eternal salvation, we ought to trust to those good works which we do. For all good works which we do are imperfect, and cannot endure the severity of God's judgment."

Page 89.

Council of Trent, Session VI. Canon XXXII. :—

"If any one shall say that the good works of a man that is justified are in such wise the gifts of God, that they are not also the good merits of him that is justified; or, that the said justified man, by the good works which are performed by him through the grace of God and the merit of Christ, does not truly merit increase of grace, eternal life, and the attainment of that eternal life, if, that is, he depart in grace, and moreover an increase of glory; let him be anathema."

Saxon Confession, Art. IX. :—

"Vain therefore is the imagination of those who pretend that obedience is pleasing by its own worth, and that there is a 'meritum condigni,' as they say, and a righteousness before God which deserves eternal life."

Page 91.

Augsburg Confession, Part I. Art. XX. :—

"Our (preachers) are falsely accused of prohibiting good works. . . . In the first place, our works cannot reconcile God, or deserve remission of sins, and grace, and justification, but we obtain this by faith only.

. . . Moreover, our (preachers) teach that it is necessary to do good works, not that we may trust to deserve grace by them, but because of the will of God. Remission of sins and grace are apprehended by faith only. And because by faith the Holy Spirit is received, already our hearts are renewed, and put on new affections, so that they are able to bring forth good works."

Tetrapolitan Confession, Arts. III., V. :—

"First, therefore, since it has been handed down now for many years that a man's own works are necessary for his justification, our (preachers) have taught that this is to be ascribed entirely to the good pleasure of God and the merit of Christ, and that it is appropriated by faith only . . . .

"We are so far from rejecting good works that we do utterly deny that any man can fully be saved, except he advance thus far by the Spirit of Christ, that none of those good works be wanting in him, whereunto indeed God hath created him."

Bohemian Confession, Arts. IX., X. :—

"A saving faith . . . thus performs by love all sorts of good and holy works, by which it is known, as a tree is known by its fruit. For as fire cannot be without heat, or the sun without radiance, so also a true faith which partakes of Christ cannot ever or anywhere be without renewal, and without love, and, what is more, without many holy and good works. . . .

"And such good works are pleasing to God, not because of any dignity or perfection belonging to themselves . . . but they are pleasing to God, only through Jesus Christ, in the person or man who has first been justified by Christ the Lord, through faith in Him, and has been rendered acceptable to God, when he believes."

Page 92.

Belgic Confession, Art. XXIV. :—

"It cannot be, therefore, that this holy faith is idle in a man; for we do not speak of a vain and dead faith, but only of that which in the Scripture is said to work by love, and which moves a man to exercise himself in those works which God Himself has commanded in His Word. But these works which spring from the sincere root of this faith are for this reason good and pleasing to God, viz., because they are sanctified by His grace; but for our justification they are of no avail."

Second Helvetic Confession, Art. XVI. :—

"For we teach that good works do truly spring from a living faith, through the Holy Spirit, and are done by the faithful according to

the Divine will, or the rule of God's Word. . . . We therefore condemn all who despise good works, and foolishly speak of them as not to be cultivated, and useless. Meanwhile, as has been already said, we do not think that we are saved by good works, and that they are so necessary to salvation that without them no one is ever saved."

ARTICLE XIII.

Page 96.

COUNCIL OF TRENT, Session VI. :—

CANON I.—"If any one shall say that man may be justified before God by his own works, whether done through the strength of human nature, or through the teaching of the Law, without the Divine grace through Jesus Christ; let him be anathema.

CANON II.—"If any one shall say that, without the preventing inspiration of the Holy Spirit and His help, man can believe, hope, love, or be penitent, as he ought, so that the grace of justification may be conferred upon him; let him be anathema."

CANON VII.—"If any one shall say that all works which are done before justification, in what manner soever they be done, are truly sins, or deserve the hatred of God, or that the more earnestly one strives to dispose himself for grace, so much the more grievously he sins; let him be anathema."

ARTICLE XIV.

Page 99.

BELLARMINE "De Monachis," Cap. VII. :—

"By a counsel of perfection we mean a good work, not ordered us by Christ, but indicated; not commanded, but commended."

Ibid., Cap. VIII. :—

"It is the opinion of all Catholics that many things are truly and properly Evangelical counsels, but especially three—chastity, obedience, and poverty, which are neither commanded, nor are they things indifferent, but are pleasing to God, and commended by Him."

Ibid., Cap. XII. :—

"We see in all well-governed states that, besides rewards and punishments . . . there are also some rewards decreed for heroic actions . . . so therefore it is not unreasonable, nay, rather it is very reasonable, that besides life eternal which is promised to them that keep the Divine Law, there should be also certain rewards and singular honours for such as not only keep the Law of God, but also exhibit heroic virtues."

Page 100.

WURTEMBURG CONFESSION, Art. VI. :—

"But the opinion of some, that man can in this life attain to such a pitch as not only to fulfil the Decalogue by his own works, but also to be able to do more and greater works than are commanded in the Decalogue, which they call works of supererogation, is foreign to the prophetic and Apostolic doctrine, and repugnant to the opinion of the true Catholic Church."

ARTICLE XV.

Page 101.

REFORMATIO LEGUM, "De Haeresibus," Cap. 8 :—

"The pride of those men must be broken by our laws, who attribute such perfection of life to men that are justified, as neither the weakness of our nature produces, nor any one can take to himself save Christ."

Page 103.

COUNCIL OF TRENT, Session V. :

"This same holy synod doth nevertheless declare that it is not its intention to include in this decree, where Original Sin is treated of, the Blessed and immaculate Virgin Mary."

THE BULL "INEFFABILIS" of Pope Pius IX. :—

"We declare, pronounce, and define that the doctrine is revealed by God, and on that account is to be firmly and constantly believed by all the faithful, which holds that the most Blessed Virgin Mary in the first moment of her conception was, by the singular grace and privilege of Almighty God, in regard to the merits of Christ Jesus the Saviour of the human race, preserved pure from all stain of Original Sin."

ARTICLE XVI.

Page 105.

SCHMALKALD ARTICLES, "De falsa poenitentia" :—

"Do whatever you please; only believe; nothing harms you. Faith blots out all sins." They add besides: "If any one sin after faith, and after receiving the Holy Spirit, he never truly had the Spirit or faith."

Reformatio Legum, "De Haeresibus," Cap. 9 :—

"They also hold a perverse opinion about them that are justified who believe that they, after that they have once been justified, cannot fall into sin, or that if perchance they do any of those things which are forbidden by the laws of God, God does not account them as sins. To whom those are contrary in opinion, but equal in impiety, who affirm that any mortal sin whatsoever which is voluntarily committed by us after we have received Baptism, is sin against the Holy Ghost, and cannot be remitted."

Page 107.

Augsburg Confession, Part I. Art. XII. :—

"They condemn the Anabaptists, who deny that they who have once been justified can lose the Holy Spirit, and who, moreover, maintain that some attain such perfection in this life that they cannot sin."

Saxon Confession, Art. XVI. :—

"For, first, we do openly condemn the Cathari and Novatians, who feigned that the elect cannot fall into sins against conscience, and that those who have lapsed after amendment of life ought not to be received again."

Council of Trent, Session VI. Canon XXIII. :—

"If any one shall say that a man once justified can sin no more, nor lose grace, and that therefore he who falls and sins was never truly justified; or, on the other hand, that he is able, throughout his whole life, to avoid all sins, even those that are venial (except by a special privilege from God, as the Church holds respecting the Blessed Virgin Mary); let him be anathema."

Page 108.

Calvin's Institutes, III. xxiv. 6, 7 :—

"But now it is not to be doubted but that, when Christ prays for all the elect, He prays the same thing for them as for Peter, that their faith may never fail. From which we conclude that they are beyond danger of falling away, because the intercessions of the Son of God for their constancy in godliness have not been rejected. What did Christ wish us to learn from this, save that we should trust that we shall be safe for ever, because we have once been made His? But it daily happens that those who seemed to be Christ's fall away from Him again, and are ruined . . . but it is equally certain that such persons never adhered to Christ with that confidence of the heart, by which I affirm that certainty of our election is assured to us."

LAMBETH ARTICLES, V. :—

"A true, living, and justifying faith, and the sanctifying Spirit of God, is not extinguished, does not fall away, or vanish away, in the elect, either finally or totally."

Page 110.

AUGSBURG CONFESSION, Part I. Art. XII. :—

"The Novatians also are condemned, who were unwilling to absolve those who had lapsed after Baptism, even when they returned to penitence."

ARTICLE XVII.

Page 112.

PETER MARTYR, on Romans (p. 411) :—

"I say, therefore, that Predestination is the most wise purpose of God, whereby, before all eternity, He has constantly decreed to call those whom He hath loved in Christ to the adoption of sons, to justification by faith, and at length to glory through good works, that they may be conformed to the image of the Son of God, and that there may be declared in them the glory and mercy of the Creator."

Page 115.

CALVIN'S INSTITUTES, III. xxi. 5 :—

"By Predestination we mean the eternal decree of God, by which He has determined with Himself what He would have to become of each individual man. For all are not created in like condition, but for some eternal life, and for other eternal damnation, is fore-ordained. Therefore, according as each one was created for one of these two ends, we say that he is predestinated either to life or to death."

Ibid., III. xxiii. 1 :—

"Many indeed, as if they could avert odium from God, acknowledge election in such a way as to deny that any one is reprobated, but altogether absurdly and childishly, since election itself would not stand unless it were opposed to reprobation. God is said to separate those whom He adopts to salvation; to say that others obtain by chance, or acquire by their own industry, that which election alone confers on a few would be worse than absurd. Those, therefore, whom God passes over He reprobates, and that from no other cause than that He wills to exclude them from the inheritance which He predestinates for His sons."

Page 116.

French Confession, Art. XII. :—

"We believe that out of this universal corruption and damnation, in which all men are by nature submerged, God delivers some, but others He leaves in that corruption and damnation."

Lambeth Articles, I. :—

"God from eternity has predestinated some to life, and others He has reprobated to death."

Canons of Dort, "De Divina Praedestinatione," Art. VI. :—

"And here especially there unfolds itself to us the deep, and both merciful and just, difference put between men who are all alike lost; that is to say, that decree of election and reprobation revealed in the Word of God."

Calvin's Institutes, III. xxi. 5 :—

"They involve Predestination in many cavils, especially those who make God's foreknowledge the cause of it."

Calvin's Institutes, III. xxii. 11 :—

"Therefore, if we are not able to assign any reason why He grants mercy to His own except because such is His pleasure, neither shall we find any other cause than His will for the reprobation of others."

Lambeth Articles, II. :—

"The moving or efficient cause of Predestination to life is not the foreseeing of faith, or of perseverance, or of any other thing in the persons predestinated, but only God's will and good pleasure."

Canons of Dort, "De Divina Praedestinati[on]," Arts. IX., X. :—

"This same election was made, not becau[se] there was foreseen faith, and obedience of faith, holiness, or any othe[r] good quality and disposition, as a cause or condition required befo[re] the man to be elected; but election is unto faith, and obedien[ce] [to] faith, holiness. . . . But the cause of this free election is the good p[leasure] of God alone."

Page 117.

Confession of the Remonstrants, XVII. 3 :—

"Calling is effectual from the result, rather than from the intention of God alone, as thus stated, which apportions its saving effect of its own self, not indeed because, out of an absolute determination to save, it is in such a way administered, by some singular and secret wisdom of

God, that it agrees, so as to bring forth fruit, with the will of him that is called; nor because therein the will of him that is called is by some irresistible power, or by some almighty force, in such a way effectually determined to belief, that he cannot refuse to believe and obey."

Page 118.

CALVIN'S INSTITUTES, III. xxiii. 12 :—

"This consideration also they urge to overthrow Predestination, viz., that its acceptance destroys all anxiety and exertion for right living. . . . Thus all will abandon themselves to despair, and go headlong into an abandoned manner of life, whithersoever their lust shall carry them. And truly they do not altogether lie."

Page 119.

Ibid., III. xxiv. 4 :—

"But though the discussion of Predestination be considered like a dangerous ocean, yet in traversing it, a safe and peaceful, and I will add a pleasant, passage lies open, unless any one wishes of his own accord to expose himself to danger. For as they plunge into a fatal abyss who examine into the eternal counsel of God, without the Word, in order that they may become assured of their own election; so they who investigate the same matter in a right and orderly manner, as it is contained in the Word, derive thence a peculiar benefit of consolation."

REFORMATIO LEGUM, "De Haeresibus," Cap. 22 :—

"Wherefore all men are to be warned by us, that in undertaking actions they refer not themselves to decrees of Predestination, but fashion the whole tenor of their life according to the laws of God, since they observe that both promises to the good and threats to the wicked are generally set forth in Holy Scripture."

Page 120.

CALVIN'S INSTITUTES, III. xxi. 5 :—

"By Predestination we mean the eternal decree of God, by which He hath determined with Himself what He would have to become of each individual man. . . . Therefore, according as each one was created for one of these two ends, we say that he is predestinated either to life or to death."

Ibid., III. xxi. 7 :—

"Though it is sufficiently clear that God, by His secret counsel, freely chooses whom He will, the rest being rejected; yet His free election is as yet only half displayed until we come to particular individuals."

Ibid., III. xxiv. 1 :—

"I have already made a statement refuting the error of those to whom the general character of the promises seems to apply equally to the whole human race."

Reformatio Legum, "De Haeresibus," Cap. 22 :—

"For we ought to approach to the worship of God by those ways, and to abide in that will of God, which we see to be set forth in Holy Scripture."

Page 121.

Council of Trent, Session VI. :—

"No one, moreover, so long as he lives in this mortal state, ought so far to presume concerning the secret mystery of Divine predestination as to determine for certain that he is assuredly in the number of the predestinated; as if it were true that he who is justified either cannot sin any more, or if he does sin, that he ought to promise himself a sure repentance; for except by a special revelation it cannot be known whom God hath chosen unto Himself."

Ibid., Session VI. Canon XVII. :—

"If any one shall say that the grace of justification only befalls them that are predestinated unto life, but that all the rest who are called are called indeed, but do not receive grace, as being, by Divine power, predestinated to evil; let him be anathema."

ARTICLE XVIII.

Page 122.

Reformatio Legum, "De Haeresibus," Cap. 11 :—

"Dreadful and monstrous is the audacity of those who maintain that men may hope for salvation in any religion or sect which they have professed, if only they strive to the best of their power for innocence and integrity of life, according to the light which shines upon them infused by nature. But by the authority of the Sacred Scripture pests of this kind are altogether silenced; for there the Name of Jesus Christ is solely and alone mentioned to us, whereby we may attain salvation."

Page 123.

Council of Trent, Session V. :—

"In order that our Catholic faith, without which it is impossible to please God, may remain steadfast."

ARTICLE XIX.

Page 127.

Augsburg Confession, Part I. Art. VII. :—

"The Church is the congregation of saints, in which the Gospel is duly taught, and the Sacraments duly administered."

Page 128.

Saxon Confession, Art. XII. :—

"We say, therefore, that the visible Church in this life is the congregation of those who embrace the Gospel of Christ, and duly use the Sacraments."

Ibid., Art. XV. :—

"For God wishes His Church to be seen and heard in the world, and wishes it to be distinguished from the rest of the peoples by many public signs."

Page 129.

Scotch Confession, Art. XVI. :—

"As we believe in one God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, so also we constantly believe that from the beginning there has been, that there now is (Matt. iii. 9), and that unto the end of the world there will be one Church ; *i.e.*, a society and multitude of men elected by God. . . . This Church is invisible, known to God alone, Who alone knows whom He has chosen."

Second Helvetic Confession, Art. XVII. :—

"Whence also the Church may be called invisible, not because men are invisible, of whom the Church is made up, but because, being hidden from our eyes and known to God alone, it often escapes man's judgment."

Page 132.

Reformatio Legum, "De Haeresibus, Cap. 21 :—

"For we thus define the visible Church as being the congregation of all faithful men, in which Holy Scripture is sincerely taught, and the Sacraments administered according to Christ's ordinance, at least in those parts of them that are necessary."

First Helvetic Confession, Art. XV. :—

"And this Church, though it is known to the eyes of God alone, yet not only is perceived and known by certain external rites, instituted by

Christ Himself, and by the Word of God, as by a public and lawful discipline, but is so constituted that without these marks no one may be thought to belong to it, save by the special privilege of God."

CALVIN'S INSTITUTES, IV. i. 9 :—

"For wherever we see that the Word of God is sincerely preached and heard, and where the Sacraments are administered according to Christ's institution, there it is by no means to be doubted that there is a Church of God."

SCOTCH CONFESSION, Art. XVIII. :—

"The Notes, therefore, of the true Church of God we believe, confess, and profess to be :—First and before all things, the true preaching of the Word of God, wherein God hath revealed Himself to us, as the writings of prophets and Apostles declare unto us. . . . Secondly, the due administration of the Sacraments of Jesus Christ, which should be joined to the Word and promise of God, that they may confirm and seal it in our hearts. In the last place, Ecclesiastical discipline, duly administered as the Word of God prescribes, for the repressing of vice and the nourishing of virtue."

Page 133.

REFORMATIO LEGUM, "De Haeresibus," Cap. 21 :—

"We must restrain by the bond of law the madness of those who think the Church of Rome to be founded on a rock of such a kind that it has never erred, nor can err; whereas both many errors thereof may be recounted from the records of our ancestors, and even might be brought forward from our own, partly in those matters whereon our life ought to be fashioned, partly also in those whereon our faith ought to be built up."

ARTICLE XX.

Page 134.

WURTEMBURG CONFESSION, Art. XXXII. :—

"We believe and confess . . . that this Church has power to judge concerning all doctrines . . . that this Church has power to interpret Scripture. . . . Wherefore, also, the Church has authority to judge concerning doctrines, in such a way that nevertheless she restrain herself within the bounds of Holy Scripture, which is the voice of her Spouse, from which voice it is not right for any one, not even for an angel, to depart."

Page 137.

Creed of Pope Pius IV.:—

"I most firmly admit and embrace the Apostolical and Ecclesiastical traditions, and the other observances and constitutions of the same Church. . . . I also admit the Sacred Scripture according to that sense which Holy Mother Church has held, and does hold, whose province it is to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Sacred Scriptures; nor will I ever take or interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers."

Page 138.

Council of Trent, Session IV.:—

"The Synod, following the examples of the orthodox Fathers, receives and venerates, with equal affection of piety and reverence, all the books, both of the Old and New Testament, since one God is the Author of both; as also the said traditions, as well those appertaining to faith as to morals, as having been dictated either by Christ's own word of mouth, or by the Holy Spirit, and preserved by a continuous succession in the Catholic Church."

ARTICLE XXI.

Page 140.

Reformatio Legum, "De Summa Trinitate," Cap. 14:—

"For some of those Councils, such as especially these four, Nicæa, the first of Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon, we embrace and receive with great reverence. And we hold the same opinion concerning many others which were afterwards held, in which we see and confess that the most holy Fathers have established many points in a most weighty and pious manner, according to the Divine Scriptures, concerning the Blessed and Most High Trinity, concerning Jesus Christ our Lord and Saviour, and man's redemption procured by Him. Nevertheless we consider that our faith is no otherwise bound by these, except in so far as they may be confirmed from the Holy Scriptures. For it is clear that some Councils have sometimes erred, and laid down mutually contradictory definitions, partly in morals, partly also in faith."

Page 141.

Wurtemburg Confession, Art. XXXIV.:—

"We acknowledge that the Church ought to have its own judgments concerning doctrines and sacred matters, and that the authority of lawful

Councils is great. But the authority of the Word of God must be by far the greatest of all. . . . Examples also bear witness that not only Popes but even Councils have erred."

Scotch Confession, Art. XX. :—

"As we do not rashly condemn that which godly men assembled together in General Council lawfully gathered have propounded to us, so without proper examination we do not admit whatsoever is thrust upon men in the name of a General Council; for it is clear that, as they were men, so also some of them have clearly erred, and that in matters of the greatest weight and moment. So far, therefore, as the Council proves the sentence and command which it gives by the plain Word of God, just so far do we reverence and embrace the same."

Second Helvetic Confession, Art. II. :—

"Wherefore, in controversies about religion or in matters of faith, we do not allow ourselves to be pressed with bare opinions of Fathers, or decisions of Councils, much less with received customs, or even with the consensus of a great number, or with long-established order. Therefore in a matter of faith we cannot endure any other judge than God Himself pronouncing by the Holy Scriptures what is true, what is false, what is to be followed, or what avoided."

Page 145.

Second Helvetic Confession, Art. XI. :—

"And to sum up much of this subject in a few words, with a sincere heart we believe, and with free speech we boldly profess, whatsoever things are defined out of the Holy Scriptures, and contained in the Creeds, and in the decrees of the first four most illustrious Councils held at Nicæa, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon, together with the Creed of the blessed Athanasius, and all Creeds like to these, concerning the mystery of the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ; and we condemn all things contrary to these."

ARTICLE XXII.

Page 147.

Council of Trent, Session XIV. :—

"It is altogether false and alien from the Word of God that a fault is never forgiven by the Lord without the whole penalty being remitted."

Ibid., Session XIV. Canon XV. :—

"If any one shall say . . . that it is fiction that, when the eternal

penalty has been removed by the power of the keys, temporal penalty for the most part remains to be undergone; let him be anathema."

Page 148.

Ibid., Session XIV. :—

"It is added that, whilst we, in making satisfaction, suffer for our sins, we are made conformable to Christ, Who made satisfaction for our sins. . . . But neither is this satisfaction, which we discharge for our sins, in such sense our own as not to be through Christ; for we, who of ourselves can do nothing as of ourselves, can do all things by His co-operation. Thus man has nothing whereof to glory, but all our glorying is in Christ."

Ibid., Session XXV. :—

"Whereas the Catholic Church, taught by the Holy Spirit, has from the sacred writings, and the ancient tradition of the Fathers, taught in sacred Councils, and most recently in this Œcumenical Synod, that there is a Purgatory, and that the souls there detained are assisted by the aid of the faithful, but chiefly by the acceptable Sacrifice of the altar; the holy Synod enjoins upon Bishops that they take diligent care that the sound doctrine concerning Purgatory, delivered by the holy Fathers and holy Councils, be believed and held by the faithful of Christ, and everywhere preached. But let the more difficult and subtle questions, and such as tend not to edification, and from which for the most part there is no increase of piety, be excluded from popular discourses before uneducated people. In like manner, let them not allow such things as are uncertain, or which labour under an appearance of error, to be made public and treated of; but those things which tend to a certain kind of curiosity or superstition, or savour of filthy lucre, let them prohibit as scandals and stumbling-blocks of the faithful."

Page 149.

Reformatio Legum, "De Haeresibus," Cap. 12. :—

"Some impiously speculate that the souls of men who depart this life, when once they have gone out from the bodies, are wrapped in sleep, or annihilated, until the final moment of the last judgment; but that then, when the day of the last judgment shall come, they are either roused again from sleep, or rise again from destruction, with their own proper bodies."

Page 150.

Liturgy of S. James:—

"Remember, O Lord God, the spirits of all flesh, of whom we have made mention, and of whom we have not made mention, who are of the

true faith, from righteous Abel unto this day; do Thou Thyself give them rest there, in the land of the living, in Thy kingdom, in the delight of Paradise, in the bosom of Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, our holy Fathers, whence pain and grief and lamentation have fled away; there the light of Thy countenance looks upon them and gives them light evermore."

Clementine Liturgy:—

"Let us pray for those who rest in faith."

S. Cyril's Lectures, v. 9.:—

"Then we make mention, too, of them that are fallen asleep, first of patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs, that God would, at their prayers and intercessions, receive our supplication; then, too, on behalf of our holy Fathers and Bishops, and briefly of all amongst us who are fallen asleep before us, believing that it will be the greatest benefit to the souls on behalf of whom supplication is offered while the holy and most awful Sacrifice is lying before us."

Liturgy of S. Mark:—

"To the souls of all these give rest, O Sovereign Lord, our God, in the tabernacles of Thy saints, in Thy kingdom; giving them freely the good things of Thy promises."

Page 151.

Catacomb Inscriptions:—

(i.) "Kalimeros, may God refresh thy spirit, together with that of thy sister Hilara."

(ii.) "O Lord, let not the spirit of Venus be overshadowed. Of her sons who survive, Benirosus (and) Projectus."

(iii.) "O Irenea, mayest thou live in God. A. Ω."

Second Helvetic Confession, Art. XXVI.:—

"For we believe that the faithful, upon the death of the body, go direct to Christ, and therefore stand in no need of helps on the part of those who are alive, or of prayers for the departed; in short, of those services rendered for them. We believe also that the unfaithful are cast headlong direct into hell, from which no return is open to the wicked by any offices of those who are alive."

Page 152.

Bellarmine, "De Indulgentiis," I. Cap. 1:—

"The Church and the Schools of theologians mean by indulgences remissions of penalties, which often remain to be undergone after re-

mission of the faults and reconciliation have been obtained in the Sacrament of Penance, which remissions the supreme Pontiffs, of their fatherly gentleness, . . . are wont to grant at certain times, and not without some just and reasonable cause."

Page 153.

Ibid., Cap. 2 :—

"There is in the Church an unlimited treasury of satisfactions, arising from the sufferings of Christ, which shall never be able to be exhausted. . . . To this treasury of superabundant satisfactions belong also the sufferings of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and of all the other Saints, who have suffered more than their sins required."

Ibid., Cap. 5 :—

"An indulgence is properly a judicial absolution, carrying with it an expiation from the treasury."

Ibid., Cap. 7 :—

"By indulgences there is only removed the liability to temporal punishment, which remains when the fault is forgiven. . . . Indulgences set men free from liability to punishment not only before the Church, but also before God."

Ibid., Cap. 14 :—

"It is a thing most certain, and among Catholics undoubted, that indulgences can aid souls which are undergoing penalties in Purgatory."

Council of Trent, Session XXV. :—

"The Synod teaches and enjoins that the use of indulgences, most salutary for Christian people, and approved by the authority of Sacred Councils, is to be retained in the Church; and it condemns with anathema those who either assert that they are unprofitable, or deny that there is in the Church the power of granting them. Nevertheless, in granting them, it desires that moderation be observed, according to the ancient and approved custom in the Church, lest, by excessive facility, Ecclesiastical discipline be enervated. And desiring that the abuses which have crept into them, by reason of which this excellent name of indulgences is blasphemed by heretics, be amended and corrected, it has ordained generally, by this present decree, that all evil gains for the obtaining thereof, whence a most abundant cause of abuses amongst Christian people has been derived, be entirely abolished."

Page 154.

Ibid., Session XXV. :—

"Moreover, that images of Christ, of the Virgin Mother of God, and

of other Saints, are to be had and retained, especially in churches, and that due honour and veneration are to be paid to them; not that any divinity or virtue is believed to be in them, on account of which they are to be worshipped, or that anything is to be asked of them, or that confidence is to be reposed in images, as was done of old by the heathen, who placed their hope in idols; but because the honour which is shown to them is referred to the originals whom they represent, so that by means of the images which we kiss, and before which we uncover the head and prostrate ourselves, we adore Christ and venerate the Saints, whose similitude they bear."

Council of Trent, Session XXV. :—

"Moreover, in the invocation of Saints, veneration of relics, and sacred use of images, let every superstition be removed, all filthy gain abolished, finally all lasciviousness avoided, so that images be not painted or adorned with wanton beauty, and that men pervert not the commemoration of the Saints and the visitation of relics into revellings and drunkenness."

Bellarmine, "De Imaginibus," II. Cap. 21 :—

"Images of Christ and of the Saints are to be venerated, not only by accident or improperly, but also for themselves and properly, so that they themselves terminate the veneration, as they are considered in themselves, and not only as being in the stead of their originals."

Page 156.

Tetrapolitan Confession, Art. XXII. :—

"And, in fine, our (preachers) have withheld prayers before statues and images, on this account especially, viz., that they began to be openly worshipped and adored, and foolish expenditure to be lavished upon them, which should have been spent on Christ, Who was hungry, and thirsty, and naked; last, because, by the worship and outlay spent on images, though repugnant to the Word of God, men seek to deserve reward from God. . . . Our preachers also confess that in itself the use of images is indifferent; but, however indifferent it may be, a Christian ought to regard what is profitable, what edifies, and to use images in such places, and upon such principle, as to put a stumbling-block in no one's way."

Saxon Confession, Art. XXII. :—

"One is thought to be more propitious near one image, another near some other. These madnesses, since they are notoriously like those of the heathen, and without doubt do greatly provoke the wrath of God,

are both to be reproved by teachers and severely punished by godly magistrates."

Second Helvetic Confession, Art. IV. :—

"We therefore reject not only the idols of the heathen, but also the images of Christians. For although Christ took man's nature, yet He did not take it that He might furnish a model to sculptors and painters. . . . He promised that by His Spirit He would be with us for ever (John xvi.; 2 Cor. v.). Who therefore would believe that the shadow or similitude of His body confers any benefit upon the godly? . . . But that men may be instructed in religion, and put in mind of Divine things, and of their own salvation, the Lord commanded to preach the Gospel (Mark xvi.), not to paint and instruct the laity by a picture."

Schmalkald Articles :—

"The relics of the Saints are full of many lies, absurdities, and follies. Bones of dogs and of horses are often found amongst them. And though perchance some of them might have been commended, yet on account of those impostures, which pleased the devil, they ought long ago to have been condemned, especially since they have not the support of the Word of God, and are unnecessary and unprofitable."

Page 157.

Council of Trent, Session XXV. :—

"Also that the holy bodies of holy martyrs, and of others now living with Christ, which were the living members of Christ and the temple of the Holy Spirit, and which are to be raised by Him unto eternal life and glorified, are to be venerated by the faithful; through which bodies many benefits are bestowed by God upon men; so that they who affirm that veneration and honour are not due to the relics of the Saints, or that these and other sacred memorials are unprofitably honoured by the faithful, and that places dedicated to the memory of Saints are vainly visited for the purpose of obtaining their aid, are altogether to be condemned, as the Church has already long since condemned them, and does now also condemn them."

Page 158.

Martyrdom of Polycarp :—

"Some, indeed, secretly engaged Nicetas, the father of Herod and brother of Alce, to intercede with the governor so as not to give the body; 'lest,' says he, 'forsaking the Crucified, they begin to worship this Polycarp.' And this they said at the suggestion and instigation of

the Jews, who were also watching when we were preparing to take him out of the fire, not knowing that neither can we ever forsake Christ, Who suffered for the salvation of them that are saved out of the whole world; nor can we worship any other. For Him we worship, being Son of God; but the martyrs we deservedly love as disciples and imitators of the Lord, on account of their unsurpassed affection towards their King and Master, whose associates and fellow-disciples may we also become. The centurion, therefore, seeing the contention of the Jews, put his body into the midst of the fire and consumed it, as is their custom. Thus we, afterwards taking up his bones, of more value than precious stones, and more precious than gold, deposited them where it was fitting. There being gathered together, as we have opportunity, with joy and gladness, the Lord shall grant unto us to celebrate the natal day of his martyrdom, both for a memorial of those that have finished their contest before us, and for the exercise and preparation of them that are about to enter upon it."

Page 159.

Second Helvetic Confession, Art. V.:—

"But much less do we believe that the relics of the saints are to be adored or worshipped. Those holy men of old seemed to have paid sufficient honour to their dead if they had honourably committed their remains to the earth, after that the spirit had gone up to heaven, and they thought that their ancestors' most noble relics of all were their virtues, teaching, and faith, and as they commended these while praising the dead, so did they strive to express them so long as they lived upon earth."

Saxon Confession, Art. XXII.:—

"'Mary, Mother of grace, do thou protect us from the enemy, in the hour of death receive us.' These versicles we heard a monk, a doctor of theology, uttering in the presence of a dying man, and often repeating them, though he made no mention of Christ; and many examples could be recounted."

Page 160.

Council of Trent, Session XXV.:—

"The holy Synod commands all Bishops . . . that they instruct the faithful diligently, teaching them that the Saints, who reign together with Christ, offer up their prayers to God for men; that it is good and profitable suppliantly to invoke them, and to resort to their prayers, aid, and help for obtaining benefits from God, through His Son Jesus Christ our Lord, Who alone is our Redeemer and Saviour; but that they think impiously who deny that the Saints, who enjoy eternal happiness in

heaven, are to be invoked, or who assert either that they do not pray for men, or that the invocation of them that they should pray for us individually is idolatry, or that it is repugnant to the Word of God, or that it is opposed to the honour of the one Mediator between God and men, Jesus Christ, or that it is foolish to supplicate orally or mentally those who reign in heaven."

Page 162.

Tetrapolitan Confession, Art. XI. :—

"Another abuse also connected with this subject is rejected, viz., that some, by prayers and fastings, so wish to deserve well of the Virgin Mary, Mother of God, and other saints, as by means of their intercessions and merits to be free from evils both of body and soul, and enriched with good of every kind."

Augsburg Confession, Part I. Art. XXI. :—

"But Scripture does not teach us to invocate saints, or to seek aid from saints; because it sets forth to us one Christ as mediator, propitiary sacrifice, high-priest, and intercessor."

Saxon Confession, Art. XXII. :—

"In this place we reprove this heathenish corruption, viz., that the custom of those who call upon men who have departed this life is defended, and aid or intercession is sought for at their hands. . . . It is plain that this doctrine concerning the Mediator was obscured and corrupted when men went for help to the Virgin Mother, as though she were more merciful, and sought, some one mediator, some another."

Wurtemburg Confession, Art. XXIII. :—

"We confess also that the saints in heaven do, after their manner, pray for us before God, as also the angels are careful for us, and all creatures do, after a certain heavenly manner, groan for our salvation, and travail together with us, as Paul saith. But as the invoking of the rest of creatures in worship is not to be established upon the ground of their groaning, so upon the ground of the prayers of the saints in heaven, the invoking of the saints in worship is not to be approved; for with regard to invoking them there is no command or example in the Sacred Scriptures."

French Confession, Art. XXIV. :—

"Whatsoever men have pretended concerning the intercession of saints departed is nothing but a deceit and lie of Satan, that he might draw men away from the right manner of praying."

Belgic Confession, Art. XXVI. :—

"Nothing but distrust, therefore, brought in this custom, whereby we

rather dishonour the saints (whom we think to honour), while we carry on those practices, which they were so far from ever doing while they lived, that they rather constantly, and in accordance with their duty, rejected them, as their writings bear witness."

Second Helvetic Confession, Arts. V., XXIII. :—

"Wherefore we do neither adore, nor worship, nor invoke the saints in heaven, or in glory, nor do we acknowledge them for our intercessors or mediators before the Father in heaven. . . .

"The priesthood of Christ our Lord and true religion forbid us to invoke the saints in heaven, or to resort to them as intercessors."

ARTICLE XXIII.

Page 164.

Augsburg Confession, Part I. Art. XIV. :—

"Concerning Ecclesiastical order, they teach that no one ought to teach publicly in the Church, or to adminster the Sacraments, unless he be duly called."

XIII. Articles, Art. X. :—

"Concerning Ministers of the Church, we teach that no one ought to teach publicly, or to administer the Sacraments, unless he be duly called, and that by those who, according to the Word of God, and the laws and customs of each country, have the power of calling and admitting them to office in the Church."

Page 166.

First Epistle of S. Clement to the Corinthians, xlii. 4 :—

"Preaching, therefore, through countries and cities, the Apostles appointed their first-fruits, having proved them by the Spirit, to be bishops and deacons of them that should afterwards believe."

Ibid., xliv. 1–3 :—

"And our Apostles knew, by our Lord Jesus Christ, that strife should arise on account of the Ministry. For this cause, therefore, having had a perfect foreknowledge, they appointed persons as before mentioned, and then gave direction that when they should fall asleep, other approved men should succeed to their ministry. Wherefore we cannot think that those men are justly thrust out from their ministry who were appointed by the Apostles, or afterwards by other eminent men, with the consent of the whole Church, and who ministered blamelessly to the flock of Christ, with humility, in quietness, and without self-assertion, and who were for a long time well reported of by all."

Page 168.

MELANCHTHON, Apol. Augsburg Conf., VII. xiv. 23, 24 :—

"Concerning this matter, in this assembly, we have often testified that we most anxiously desire to preserve the ecclesiastical polity, and the degrees of office which have been created in the Church, even by human authority. . . . Moreover, we wish this here again made public, that we would willingly preserve the ecclesiastical and canonical polity, if only the Bishops would cease to be so violent against our churches."

CALVIN'S INSTITUTES, IV. x. 6 :—

"Therefore they contend that all their commands and ordinances ought of necessity to be observed by the Christian people, and that he who shall violate them is guilty of double disobedience, because he is a rebel against God and the Church. Certainly, if they were true bishops, I would ascribe to them some authority in this respect, not as much as they demand for themselves, but as much as is requisite for the due regulation of the polity of the Church."

CALVIN, De Necessitate Reform. Eccles. :—

"If they set forth to us such a hierarchy, in which the Bishops have eminence in such a way that they do not refuse to be subject to Christ, that they depend upon Him as upon their one and only Head, and are traced back to Him . . . then, indeed, I confess that they are deserving of any anathema, whoever they shall be, who do not reverence it and pay heed to it with implicit obedience."

ARTICLE XXIV.

Page 170.

COUNCIL OF TRENT, Session XXII. :—

"Although the Mass contains much instruction for faithful people, yet it has not seemed expedient to the Fathers that it should be everywhere celebrated in the vulgar tongue."

COUNCIL OF TRENT, Session XXII. Canon IX. :—

"If any one shall say . . . that the Mass ought only to be celebrated in the vulgar tongue . . . let him be anathema."

Page 171.

Augsburg Confession, Part II. Art. III. :—

"Almost all the ceremonies that have been in use are preserved also, except that here and there hymns in German are mingled with the Latin, and these have been added for the instruction of the people. For to this end only we have need of ceremonies, viz., that they may teach the unlearned. And not only does Paul command to use a language understood by the people in church, but so it is appointed also by human law."

Wurtemburg Confession, Art. XXVII. :—

"For as sermons and prayers ought to be spoken in a language known to the Church, so also Sacraments ought to be administered in a known language. For although it will sometimes be lawful to use a foreign language for the sake of the learned, yet the general agreement of the Catholic Church demands this, that the necessary ministrations of the Church be performed in the vernacular."

Page 172.

Second Helvetic Confession, Art. XXII. :—

"Let all foreign tongues, therefore, be silent in sacred assemblies. Let all things be set forth in the vulgar tongue, and in that which is understood in the place by men in the assembly."

ARTICLE XXV.

Page 174.

XIII. Articles, Art. IX. :—

"We teach that the Sacraments, which are instituted by the Word of God, are not only badges of profession amongst Christians, but rather they are certain sure witnesses and effectual signs of grace, and of God's goodwill toward us, by which God works invisibly in us, and pours His grace invisibly into us, if, that is, we receive them duly; and that by them faith is quickened and confirmed in them that use them."

Augsburg Confession, Part I. Art. XIII. :—

"Concerning the use of the Sacraments, they teach that the Sacraments were instituted, not only that they may be badges of profession amongst men, but rather that they may be signs and witnesses of God's goodwill toward us, for quickening and confirming faith in those who use the Sacraments set before them."

Page 175.

Ibid., Part I. Art. XIII. :—

"They therefore condemn those who teach that the Sacraments justify 'ex opere operato,' without holding that faith, which believes that sins are remitted, is necessary in using the Sacraments."

XIII. Articles, Art. IX. :—

"For neither is that true which some state, viz., that Sacraments confer grace 'ex opere operato,' without a good disposition in him that uses them; for, in reason, it is necessary for them that use them that their faith should be present, by which to believe those promises, and to receive the things promised, which are bestowed by means of the Sacraments."

Saxon Confession, Art. XV. :—

"We openly condemn the monstrous error of the monks, who have written that the receiving deserves remission of sins, and that 'ex opere operato,' without a good disposition in the receiver. This pharisaical imagination is repugnant to the passage, 'The just shall live by his faith.'"

Page 176.

Council of Trent, Session VII. Canon VIII. :—

"If any one shall say that by the said Sacraments of the New Law grace is not conferred 'ex opere operato,' but that faith alone in the Divine promise suffices for obtaining grace; let him be anathema."

Ibid., Canon VI. :—

"If any one shall say that the Sacraments of the New Law do not contain the grace which they signify, or that they do not confer that same grace upon those who do not place an obstacle in the way . . . let him be anathema."

Page 177.

Melanchthon, Apology for the Augsburg Confession :—

"Absolution can properly be called the Sacrament of Penance."

Page 178.

S. Cyril's Lectures, I. :—

"I have long since desired, true and greatly loved children of the Church, to discourse concerning these spiritual and heavenly mysteries. . . . Especially have you been made capable of receiving the more divine mysteries, having been found worthy of divine and life-giving Baptism."

Page 179.

ZWINGLI, "Fidei Ratio," § 7 :—

"I believe, nay, I know, that all Sacraments are so far from conferring grace, that they do not even convey or dispense it. In this matter I may seem to thee somewhat bold, most mighty Cæsar. But my opinion is firm. For as grace (I use the word grace in the Latin sense, taking it to mean pardon, favour, and blessing freely bestowed) is wrought or given by the Spirit of God, so that gift comes only to the spirit. But a channel or vehicle is not necessary to the Spirit, for it itself is the influence and motive-power whereby all things are borne, and has no need of being borne; nor do we ever read in the Sacred Scriptures that things of sense, such as Sacraments are, of a certainty bare with them the Spirit; but if things of sense were ever borne with the Spirit, it was even the Spirit which did bear, not the things of sense."

Page 180.

Ibid., § 7 :—

"By Baptism, therefore, the Church publicly receives him who has already been received through grace. Baptism does not, therefore, convey grace, but the Church testifies that grace has been bestowed on him to whom Baptism is given. I believe, therefore, O Cæsar, that it is a Sacrament of a sacred thing; *i.e.*, a sign of grace bestowed. I believe that it is a visible figure or form, *i.e.*, a visible type, of invisible grace, which has been bestowed and given by the gift of God, which nevertheless bears on its front almost a sort of analogy of the thing wrought by the Spirit. I believe that it is a public testimony."

Ibid., "De Baptismo" :—

"Baptism is a sign of the covenant or contract, not instituted to this end, viz., to render him who is baptized righteous, or to confirm the faith of him who is baptized. For it is impossible that any outward thing should confirm and strengthen man's faith, which is an inward thing."

Ibid., "De Baptismo" :—

"None of those things, therefore, which are external can confirm faith, or render us more certain therein. And the same statement we also make, with similar reason, concerning the Eucharist also, or Supper of the Lord."

ZWINGLI (at Marburg) :—

"Baptism is a Sacrament instituted and commanded by God for faith, not a bare sign or badge of Christian profession, but a work of

God, in which our faith is required, and by which faith we are regenerated."

Page 181.

Augsburg Confession, Part I. Art. XIII. :—

"Concerning the use of the Sacraments, they teach that the Sacraments were instituted, not only that they might be badges of profession amongst men, but rather that they might be signs and witnesses of God's goodwill toward us, for quickening and confirming faith in those who use the Sacraments set before them."

Saxon Confession, Art. XIII. :—

"Which, nevertheless, are not only signs of profession, but much rather (as antiquity said) signs of grace."

Scotch Confession, Art. XXI. :—

"Therefore we altogether condemn the vanity of those who affirm that the Sacraments are nothing else than naked and bare signs."

Belgic Confession, Art. XXXIII. :—

"Therefore those signs are by no means vain or empty."

Reformatio Legum, "De Haeresibus," Cap. 17 :—

"Great also is the rashness of those who so weaken the Sacraments as to wish them to be taken for bare signs and external marks only, as though by these badges the religion of Christian men were to be distinguished from other religions."

Calvin's Institutes, IV. xiv. 1 :—

"It seems to me that it will be a simple and appropriate definition if we say that it is an outward symbol by which the Lord seals to our consciences the promises of His goodwill toward us, to support the weakness of our faith; and we on our part testify our piety toward Him, in His presence and that of the angels, as well as before men. We may otherwise, also, more briefly define it by calling it a testimony of Divine grace toward us, confirmed by an outward sign, with reciprocal attestation of our piety toward Him."

Page 183.

Belgic Confession, Art. XXXIII. :—

"For the Sacraments are signs and visible symbols of things internal and invisible, and through them, as through media, God Himself works in us by the power of the Holy Spirit."

Reformatio Legum, "De Sacramentis," Cap. 2 :—

"For the perfection of a Sacrament three things ought to concur. The first is a plain and notable sign which may be manifestly perceived. The second is a promise of God which is represented to us and clearly confirmed by the external sign. The third is a command of God by which necessity is laid upon us partly of doing, partly of keeping in memory, those things. Since these three things occur only in the case of Baptism and the Eucharist, according to the authority of Scripture, we account these two only for true and proper Sacraments of the New Testament."

Page 184.

Council of Trent, Session VII. Canon I. :—

"If any one shall say that the Sacraments of the New Law were not all instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord, or that they are more or fewer than seven, viz., Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Orders, and Matrimony; or even that any one of these seven is not truly and properly a Sacrament; let him be anathema."

Creed of Pope Pius IV. :—

"I profess, also, that there are seven true and proper Sacraments of the New Law instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord, and necessary for the salvation of the human race, though not all necessary for each individual, . . . and that they confer grace."

Page 185.

French Confession, Art. XXXV. :—

"We acknowledge two Sacraments only common to the whole Church."

Scotch Confession, Art. XXI. :—

"We acknowledge that now, in the time of the Gospel, we have only two chief Sacraments instituted by Christ, which are commanded to be used by all those who wish to be regarded as members of His Body, viz., Baptism and the Supper, or Table, of the Lord, which is commonly called the Communion of His Body and Blood."

Belgic Confession, Art. XXXIII. :—

"Moreover, that number of Sacraments suffices for us which Christ Himself, our true and only Teacher, instituted; and these are two only, viz., the Sacrament of Baptism, and of the sacred Supper of our Lord Jesus Christ.'

Second Helvetic Confession, Art. XIX. :—

"The Sacraments of the new people are Baptism and the Lord's

Supper. There are some who reckon seven Sacraments of the new people, of which we acknowledge that Penance, Ordination of Ministers (not that Popish ordination, indeed, but the Apostolic), and Matrimony are very profitable ordinances of God, but not Sacraments. Confirmation and Extreme Unction are inventions of men, which the Church may dispense with without any loss; and we have them not in our churches, for they contain some things which we can by no means approve."

Page 188.

Saxon Confession, Art. XIX. :—

"In the rite of Confirmation there used to be made an examination of doctrine, in which men one by one recited a short statement of doctrine, and used openly to profess that they disapproved of heathenish and heretical madness, and that they wished to be and to remain members of the true Church, and that they would not depart from the true opinion which they then professed. This custom was profitable for instructing men and keeping them in the true knowledge of God. And in our churches similar things are done in catechising the young, and in private confession, in which the Pastors examine the doctrine of the people. But as to the rite of Confirmation, which the Bishops now retain, what is it but a vain shadow?"

Wurtemburg Confession, Art. XI. :—

"We do not doubt that the Apostles, at the beginning of the Gospel, which was revealed and confirmed on the day of Pentecost, conferred by imposition of hands a wonderful gift of the Holy Spirit upon those who believed in Christ, so that they spoke with diverse tongues. And we think it most profitable that children and youths be examined by the Pastors of their church in the Catechism, and be commended if they have been piously and rightly instructed, but be corrected if ill instructed. But, on the ground of this temporal action, and one confined to the persons of the Apostles themselves, a general and perpetual Sacrament ought not to be instituted in the Church without a definite command of God."

Page 190.

Origen, on Ps. xxxvii. Hom. 2 :—

"Only consider more diligently to whom thou shouldst confess thy sin. . . . If he shall understand and foresee that thy languor is such that it ought to be exposed and dealt with in the assembly of the whole Church, whereby it is likely that both the rest may be edified, and thou thyself the more readily healed."

Page 192.

Council of Trent, Session XIV. :—

"Canon I.—If any one shall say that in the Catholic Church Penance is not truly and properly a Sacrament, instituted by Christ our Lord for reconciling the faithful unto God as often as they fall into sins after Baptism ; let him be anathema."

"Canon VI.—If any one shall deny that Sacramental Confession was either instituted, or is necessary to salvation, of Divine right; or shall say that the manner of confessing sins secretly to a priest alone, which the Catholic Church from the beginning has ever observed, and still observes, is alien from the institution and command of Christ, and is a human invention ; let him be anathema."

"Canon VII.—If any one shall say that in the Sacrament of Penance it is not, of Divine right, necessary for remission of sins to confess all and individual deadly sins, . . . or, in fine, that it is not lawful to confess venial sins ; let him be anathema."

"Canon VIII.—If any one shall say that the confession of all sins, such as the Church observes, is impossible, and a human tradition to be abolished by the godly, or that all and each one of the faithful of Christ, of either sex, are not bound thereto, according to the constitution of the great Lateran Council, once a year, and that on this account the faithful are to be persuaded not to confess at the time of Lent; let him be anathema."

Page 193.

Augsburg Confession, Part II. Art. IV. :—

"Confession in the churches is not abolished amongst us . . . But concerning Confession, they teach that an enumeration of offences is not necessary, nor are consciences to be burdened by anxiety to enumerate all offences, because it is impossible to recount all offences."

Saxon Confession, Art. XVI. :—

"Concerning making private Confession to Pastors, we affirm that the rite of private Absolution is to be retained in the Church, and we constantly retain it, for many weighty reasons. But at the same time we teach that an enumeration of offences in that private conference is not to be enjoined or demanded."

Wurtemburg Confession, Art. XIV. :—

"But although we think that enumeration of sins before a priest is not necessary to salvation, and that it has no merit for remission of sins, nevertheless we endeavour that a general confession of sins, as far as may be, and is lawful, be preserved in our churches, and that

for two reasons:—One is, that by this private conference the ignorant may be admonished and instructed in necessary matters; the second is, that by this opportunity the Gospel of Christ concerning remission of sins may be heard privately, which Gospel is the true key of the Kingdom of Heaven, and absolution from sins, . . . and that by the hearing of the Gospel, or absolution, faith may be either conceived or confirmed."

Tetrapolitan Confession, Art. XX.:—

"For that ordinance of confessing sins to a priest has driven innumerable souls into deep despair, and is liable to so many corruptions that it ought long ago to have been abolished."

Second Helvetic Confession, Art. XIV.:—

"But we believe that this sincere confession, which is made to God alone, either privately between God and the sinner, or openly in church, where that general confession of sins is recited, is sufficient, and that it is not necessary for obtaining remission of sins that any one should confess his sins to a priest by whispering them into his ears, that in return he may have absolution from him, with imposition of hands, because that of this thing no commandment or example is found in the Sacred Scriptures. . . . Duly, therefore, and effectually do ministers absolve when they preach the Gospel of Christ, and thereby remission of sins, which is promised to each individual believer, even as each one is baptized, and when they testify that this belongs particularly to each one. Nor do we think that this absolution is made more effectual because of that which is mumbled in an individual ear, or over an individual head."

Page 194.

Calvin's Institutes, IV. xix. 28:—

"But as far as concerns the office of the priesthood, which is commended to us by the mouth of Christ, I willingly reckon it in the position of a Sacrament. For there is involved in it a ceremony which, in the first place, is taken from the Scriptures, and which, in the second place, Paul testifies is not vain or unprofitable, but a faithful symbol of spiritual grace."

Page 196.

Council of Trent, Session XXIV. Canon VII.:—

"If any one shall say that the Church errs in that she has taught and now teaches, according to the Evangelical and Apostolic doctrine, that the bond of matrimony cannot be dissolved on account of the adultery of one of the parties; and that both, or even the innocent party who

did not give occasion to the adultery, cannot contract another marriage during the lifetime of the other party; and that he is guilty of adultery who, having put away the adulteress, shall marry another wife, as also she who, having put away the adulterer, shall wed another husband; let him be anathema."

Saxon Confession, Art. XVIII. :—

"Marriage is not forbidden to the innocent party, when, after the case has been tried, he (or she) is pronounced free."

Page 197.

Council of Trent, Session XIV. :—

"It is also declared that this Unction is to be applied to the sick, but especially to those who lie in such danger as to seem placed at their departure from life; whence also it is called the Sacrament of the departing."

Page 198.

Calvin's Institutes, IV. xix. 18 :—

"This Unction is of the same kind as we have above proved imposition of hands to be; for it is a piece of stage-acting, by which, without any reason, and without result, they affect to imitate the Apostolic example."

Saxon Confession, Art. XIX. :—

"Moreover, the Unction which is now named Extreme was in time past a means of healing, as is clear from the Epistle of James. Now it is a spectacle full of superstition. They say that sins are remitted through these Unctions, and they add invocation of the dead, which also we must disapprove. Therefore these ceremonies are not retained in our churches, neither before these times did the Church think them to be necessary."

Wurtemburg Confession, Art. XXII. :—

"We acknowledge that the Apostles anointed the sick with oil, and they obtained bodily health. We acknowledge also that the Epistle which bears the name of James commands that the elders of the Church be called to the sick, that they may anoint them with oil, and pray for them that they may obtain health. But these things were profitably practised at the time when the ministers of the Church were still endued with the gift of healing the sick corporally and wonderfully. But after that this gift ceased, when the Gospel was confirmed in the Church, it is self-evident that this ceremony of Unction is now idly and unprofitably used."

Second Helvetic Confession, Art. XXV. :—

"As for the Popish visitation of the sick with that extreme Unction of theirs, we have said above that we do not approve it, because it has absurd things in it, and is not approved by the Canonical Scripture."

ARTICLE XXVI.

Page 202.

Augsburg Confession, Part I. Art. VIII. :—

"Although the Church is properly the congregation of saints, and of them that truly believe, nevertheless, since in this life many hypocrites and evil men are mingled with them, we may use the Sacraments which are administered by evil men, according to the saying of Christ, 'The Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' seat,' &c. Both the Sacraments and the Word are effectual, on account of the institution and command of Christ, even though they are set forth by evil men. They condemn the Donatists, and those like them, who used to deny that we may use the ministry of evil men in the Church, and to think that the ministry of evil men is unprofitable and ineffectual."

Reformatio Legum, "De Haeresibus," Cap. 15 :—

"Next they separate themselves from the body of the Church, and refuse to approach with others to the Holy Table of the Lord, saying that they are kept back either by the wickedness of the ministers, or of other brethren."

Second Helvetic Confession, Art. XVIII. :—

"But we detest the prevalent error of the Donatists, who esteem doctrine and administration of the Sacraments effectual or ineffectual according as the life of the minister is good or evil."

Page 203.

Council of Trent, Session VII. Canon XI. :—

"If any one shall say that in ministers, when they consecrate and confer the Sacraments, there is not required the intention at least of doing what the Church does; let him be anathema."

Page 204.

S. Augustine, "De Bapt. contr. Donat." :—

"But the Baptism of Christ is consecrated by the words of the Gospel, and is holy even as ministered by adulterers to adulterers, although they be impure and unclean; because its holiness cannot be

polluted, and the power of God is present in His own Sacrament, whether for the salvation of those who use it well, or for the destruction of those who use it ill."

Page 205.

SECOND HELVETIC CONFESSION, Art. XVIII. :—

"And there ought meanwhile to be proper discipline amongst ministers. For diligent inquiry should be made into the doctrine and life of ministers in Synods. The sinners should be rebuked by the elders and brought back into the way if they are capable of restoration to health, or deposed and driven away from the Lord's flock as wolves by the true shepherds if they are incurable."

ARTICLE XXVII.

Page 208.

TEACHING OF THE TWELVE APOSTLES, Cap. VII. :—

"Now concerning Baptism, thus baptize ye: having first uttered all these things, baptize into the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, in living water. But if thou hast not living water, baptize in other water; and if thou canst not in cold, then in warm. But if thou hast neither, pour water upon the head thrice, into the Name of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit."

CALVIN'S INSTITUTES, IV. XV. 1 :—

"Wherefore those who have imagined that Baptism is nothing else than a badge and mark by which we profess our religion before men, as soldiers bear the insignia of their commander for a mark of their profession, have not considered that which is the principal thing in Baptism, *i.e.*, that it ought to be received by us with this promise, 'Whosoever shall believe and be baptized shall be saved.'"

Page 210.

AGREEMENT OF ZURICH, XX. :—

"Those who have been baptized in early infancy God regenerates in childhood, or as they grow up to manhood, sometimes even in old age."

Page 211.

CALVIN'S INSTITUTES, IV. XV. 22 :—

"The Sacrament is added afterwards like a seal, not to give efficacy to the promise of God, as though in itself it wanted validity, but only

to confirm it to us. Whence it follows that the children of the faithful are not baptized that they may then first become sons of God, who before were strangers from the Church; because by virtue of the promise they already before belonged to the Body of Christ."

Page 213.

XIII. Articles, Art. VI. :—

"But because infants are born with Original Sin they have need of remission of that sin, and it is so remitted (by Baptism) that its guilt is taken away."

Page 214.

Tertullian, "De Bapt.," Cap. XVIII. :—

"In accordance, therefore, with the condition, disposition, and age also of each person the delay of Baptism is more profitable, and especially in the case of infants. . . . The Lord, indeed, says, 'Do not keep back the infants from coming to Me.' Let them come as they grow up; let them come when they learn, when they are taught whither they come; let them become Christians when they shall be able to know Christ. Why should the age of innocence be in a hurry for remission of sins?"

Page 215.

Reformatio Legum, "De Haeresibus," Cap. 18 :—

"Then their cruel impiety attacks Baptism, which they are unwilling should be given to infants, but altogether without any reason."

Page 216.

Augsburg Confession, Part I. Art. IX. :—

"Concerning Baptism, they teach . . . that children ought to be baptized, who, being by Baptism dedicated to God, are received into His favour."

"They condemn the Anabaptists, who disapprove the Baptism of children, and affirm that children are saved without Baptism."

Tetrapolitan Confession, Art. XVII. :—

"Our (preachers) teach that Baptism is to be bestowed on infants also, no less than of old time under Moses they were circumcised."

Saxon Confession, Art. XIV. :—

"We retain also the Baptism of infants, because it is most certain that the promise of grace pertains also to infants, and to those only who are grafted into the Church. Because concerning them it is said, 'Suffer

little children to come unto Me, because of such is the kingdom of heaven.' . . . And we do not judge this custom to be only an idle ceremony, but that infants are then truly received by God and sanctified, because they are then grafted into the Church, and to such the promise pertains."

Wurtemburg Confession, Art. X. :—

"We recognise that Baptism is, by the institution of Christ, to be administered as well to infants as to adults in the Church."

French Confession, Art. XXXV. :—

"Moreover, although Baptism be a Sacrament of faith and repentance, nevertheless, since God counts their posterity also with the parents as in the Church, we affirm that infants born of holy parents ought to be baptized, on the authority of Christ."

Scotch Confession, Art. XXIII. :—

"We acknowledge and confess that Baptism belongs as well to infants of the faithful as to the faithful themselves who are grown up and endued with knowledge, and therefore we condemn the error of the Anabaptists, who refuse Baptism to infants until they shall have knowledge and faith."

Belgic Confession, Art. XXXIV. :—

"Therefore here we do detest the error of the Anabaptists, who not only are not content with only one Baptism, and that once received, but also condemn the Baptism of infants born of faithful parents. But we believe that they ought to be baptized and sealed with the sign of the Covenant, for the same reason that little children in old time were circumcised in Israel."

Second Helvetic Confession, Art. XX. :—

"We condemn the Anabaptists, who deny that little infants newly born of faithful parents ought to be baptized. For, according to the doctrine of the Gospel, theirs is the kingdom of God, and they are in the Covenant of God. Why, therefore, should not the sign of God's Covenant be given to them? Why should not they be initiated by holy Baptism who are God's peculiar people, and in His Church?"

ARTICLE XXVIII.

Page 223.

Zwingli, iii. 263 :—

'Whether, therefore, we call it Eucharist, or gathering together, or Lord's Supper, it is nothing else than a commemoration, by which those

who firmly believe that they are reconciled to the Father by the death and blood of Christ, proclaim this life-giving death; *i.e.*, praise it, give thanks for it, and preach it. Now, therefore, it follows that those who come together to this custom or festivity to commemorate the Lord's death, *i.e.*, to proclaim it, testify by the very fact that they are members of one body, that they are one bread."

Page 224.

Exhortation in the Communion Office:—

"For as the benefit is great when we spiritually eat the Body and drink the Blood of Christ, when we abide in Christ, and have Christ dwelling in us, and are made one with Him, which happens to those who approach worthily, *i.e.*, with a contrite and humble heart, with true faith and sure trust in the mercy promised through Christ; so there is danger if we approach unworthily, because we are made guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord, and eat to our judgment and condemnation, because we do not discern the Lord's Body, nor hold It in the honour which is due to It."

Page 225.

Fourth Lateran Council:—

"But there is one universal Church of the faithful, outside of which no one at all is saved; in which the same Jesus Christ is Himself both Priest and Sacrifice, Whose Body and Blood are truly contained in the Sacrament of the Altar, under the appearance of bread and wine, the bread being transubstantiated into His Body, and the wine into His Blood, by Divine power, so that for the perfecting of our mystical union we ourselves may receive of His that which He Himself received of ours."

Council of Trent, Session XIII.:—

"But because Christ our Redeemer declared that which He offered under the appearance of bread to be truly His own Body, therefore it has ever been held in the Church of God, and this holy Synod does now declare it anew, that by the consecration of the bread and wine a conversion takes place of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the Body of Christ our Lord, and of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of His Blood, and this conversion is, by the Holy Catholic Church, conveniently and properly called Transubstantiation.

Ibid., Session XIII. Canon II.:—

"If any one shall say that in the holy Sacrament of the Eucharist the substance of the bread and of the wine remains conjointly with the

Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and shall deny that wondrous and singular conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the Body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the Blood, the appearance only of Bread and Wine remaining, which conversion, indeed, the Catholic Church most fitly calls Transubstantiation; let him be anathema."

Page 226.

Reformatio Legum, "De Haeresibus," Cap. 19:—

"For it is foreign and strange to the Sacred Writings, . . . and differs very much from the condition of Sacraments; lastly, it is as it were a common sink of many superstitions which have been brought into the Church of God."

Calvin's Institutes, IV. xvii. 14:—

"The nature of a Sacrament, therefore, is overthrown unless, in its manner of signifying, the earthly sign correspond to the heavenly reality; and consequently we lose the truth of this mystery unless true bread represent the true Body of Christ."

Wurtemburg Confession, Art. XIX.:—

"The very necessity of the truth of a Sacrament seems to demand that, with the true presence of the Body of Christ, true bread should remain."

Page 227.

Zwingli, "Exposition of the Christian Faith," §§ 63–66:—

"Spiritually to eat the Body of Christ is nothing else than to lean upon the mercy and goodness of God, through Christ, with the spirit and the mind. . . . But when thou comest to the Lord's Supper with this spiritual eating, and givest thanks to the Lord for so great a benefit, for the setting free of thy soul, in that thou hast been set free from the ruin of despair, and for the pledge whereby thou art assured of eternal blessedness; and when thou partakest of the bread and wine, which are symbols of Christ's Body, in company with the brethren, then thou eatest aright sacramentally; *i.e.*, when thou doest the same thing within that thou performest in outward appearance, when the mind is refreshed by that faith which thou attestest by symbols."

Ignatius, "Ad. Smyrn.," VII.:—

"They abstain from the Eucharist and from prayer, because they confess not that the Eucharist is the flesh of our Saviour, Jesus Christ, which suffered for our sins, and which the Father, of His goodness, raised from the dead."

Page 228.

JUSTIN MARTYR, Apol. I. 66 :—

"For not as common bread nor as common drink do we receive these, but in like manner as, by the word of God, Jesus Christ our Saviour was made flesh, and had flesh and blood for the sake of our salvation; so also we have been taught that the food which has been consecrated by the word of prayer in His own words, from which our flesh and blood are nourished by assimilation, is the Flesh and Blood of that same Jesus Who was made flesh."

IRENÆUS, "Adv. Haer.," V. 2 :—

"When, therefore, both the mingled cup and the created bread receive the word of God, and become the Eucharist of the Body of Christ, and by them the substance of our flesh both grows and consists, how can they say that the flesh is not capable of receiving the gift of God, *i.e.*, life eternal, when it is nourished by the Body and Blood of Christ, and is a member of Him."

S. CYRIL'S LECTURES, III. 3 :—

"For as the bread of the Eucharist after the invocation of the Holy Spirit is no longer mere bread, but the Body of Christ."

S. CYRIL'S LECTURES, IV. 6 :—

"Wherefore contemplate not the bread and wine as mere elements, for they are the Body and Blood of Christ, according to the Lord's declaration; for even if sense suggest this to you, let faith rather stablish you. Judge not the matter from taste, but be fully assured without doubt that you have been vouchsafed the Body and Blood of Christ."

Page 230.

COUNCIL OF TRENT, Session XIII. :—

"For neither are these things repugnant the one to the other, that our Saviour Himself ever sitteth at the right hand of the Father in heaven, according to the natural mode of existing, and that none the less He is in many other places sacramentally present unto us in His own substance, by that manner of existing, which, though we can scarcely express it in words, we nevertheless can, with the understanding illuminated by faith, suppose, and ought most constantly to believe, to be possible unto God."

Page 231.

CAJETAN, "De Eucharistia," Cap. V. :—

"The true Body of Christ is eaten in the Sacrament, only not corporally, but spiritually. A spiritual eating which takes place through

the soul is suitable to the Flesh of Christ, as it is present in the Sacrament."

Augsburg Confession, Part I. Art. X. :—

"Concerning the Lord's Supper, they teach that the Body and Blood of Christ are truly present, and are distributed to them that eat in the Lord's Supper; and they disapprove them that teach otherwise."

Saxon Confession, Art. XV. :—

"But in the appointed use in this Communion Christ is truly and substantially present, and the Body and Blood of Christ are truly set before them that partake."

Page 232.

Wurtemburg Confession, Art. XIX. :—

"Concerning the substance of the Eucharist, we hold and teach that the true Body of Christ and His true Blood are distributed in the Eucharist; and we refute those who say that the bread and wine of the Eucharist are only signs of the absent Body and Blood of Christ."

Formula of Concord, p. 559 :—

"We believe that in the Lord's Supper the Body and Blood of Christ are truly and substantially present, and that, together with the bread and wine, they are truly distributed and received. We believe that the words of the Testament of Christ are not to be taken otherwise than in their literal sense, so that it is not the case that the bread signifies the absent Body of Christ, and the wine His absent Blood, but, on account of Sacramental union, the bread and the wine are truly the Body and Blood of Christ."

Formula of Concord, p. 736 :—

"They teach that as in Christ two distinct and unchanged natures are inseparably united, so in the sacred Supper two diverse substances, viz., the natural bread and the true natural Body of Christ, are present here upon earth at the same time in the appointed administration of the Sacrament."

Augsburg Confession, Part II. Art. III. :—

"Our Churches are falsely accused of abolishing the Mass, for the Mass is retained amongst us, and is celebrated with the greatest reverence. Almost all the ceremonies that have been in use are also preserved."

Saxon Confession, Art. XV. :—

"In celebrating the rite itself we preserve the accustomed use of the universal ancient Church, Latin and Greek."

Page 233.

Calvin's Institutes, IV. xvii. 12 :—

"For Satan has exerted amazing subtlety on this point to draw away the minds of men from heaven and involve them in perverse error, as though Christ were attached to the element of bread. And, in the first place, indeed, we must by no means dream of such a presence of Christ in the Sacrament as Roman ingenuity has invented, as though by a local presence the Body of Christ were set forth to be felt by the hands, crushed by the teeth, and swallowed by the mouth."

Ibid., IV. xvii. 16 :—

"Others . . . acknowledge that the bread in the Supper is truly the substance of the earthly and corruptible element, and undergoes no change in inself, but that it has included under it the Body of Christ. . . . But because by placing the Body itself in the bread they attribute ubiquity to it, which is contrary to its nature, and by adding 'under the bread' they mean that it lies concealed there; it is necessary shortly to drag out such subtleties from their hiding-places."

Ibid., IV. xvii. 3 :—

"Therefore they are represented to us under bread and wine, that we may learn not only that they are ours, but that they are intended for the nourishing of our spiritual life. This is that which we have already called attention to, that by the corporal things which are set before us in the Sacrament we are led to spiritual things by a kind of analogy. Thus when bread is given to us as a symbol of the Body of Christ we ought immediately to think of this comparison, 'As bread nourishes the life of our body,' &c. . . . When we see wine set before us as a symbol of the Blood we ought to think of the uses of wine to the body," &c. . . .

Page 234.

Calvin's Institutes, IV. xvii. 33 :—

"But I deny that it can ever be eaten without the taste of faith; or (if the language of Augustine be preferred) I deny that men carry away more from the Sacrament than they collect in the vessel of faith."

Ibid., IV. xvii. 19 :—

"Whatever may serve to express the true and substantial communication of the Lord's Body and Blood, which is set forth to the faithful under the sacred symbols of the Supper, I willingly admit, and in such a way that they are understood to receive, not in the imagination only,

or with the understanding of the mind, but to enjoy the thing itself for the nourishing of eternal life."

Calvin's Institutes, IV. xvii. 21 :—

"But if symbols invented by man, which are images of things absent rather than marks of things present, of which also they very often give a fallacious representation, are nevertheless sometimes distinguished by the names of the things they signify; with much greater reason do those which are instituted by God borrow the names of those things of which they always bear a correct, and by no means fallacious, representation, and by the truth of which they are accompanied."

French Confession, Art. XXXVI. :—

"For although He is now in heaven, and there shall remain until He come to judge the world, yet we believe that by the secret and incomprehensible power of His Spirit, apprehended by faith, He nourishes and quickens us with the substance of His Body and Blood."

Scotch Confession, Art. XXI. :—

"And also that in the Lord's Supper, rightly used, Christ is so joined to us as to be the very nourishment and food of our souls."

Belgic Confession, Art. XXXV. :—

"But in order that Christ might figure or represent to us this spiritual and heavenly Bread, He hath ordained earthly and visible bread and wine for a Sacrament of His Body and Blood, that by these He might testify to us that as we truly receive and hold this Sacrament in our hands and eat it with our mouth (whereby, also, afterwards this life of ours is sustained), so truly, also, do we by faith (which is to our soul like hand and mouth) receive the true Body and the true Blood of Christ in our souls, for the cherishing of spiritual life within us."

Page 235.

Second Helvetic Confession, Art. XXI. :—

"Therefore the faithful receive that which is given by the Lord's minister, and eat the bread of the Lord, and drink of the cup of the Lord; meanwhile within, by the working of Christ through the Holy Spirit, they receive also the Flesh and Blood of the Lord, and feed upon these unto life eternal."

Confessio Variata :—

"That together with the bread and wine the Body and Blood of Christ are truly set before us."

Calvin's Institutes, IV. xvii. 11 :—

"I say, therefore, that in the mystery of the Supper, by the symbols of bread and wine, Christ is truly set before us; *i.e.*, His Body and Blood."

Council of Trent, Session XIII. :—

"It hath been instituted by Christ the Lord that it may be received."

Page 236.

Justin Martyr, Apol. I. 65 :—

"When he who officiates has performed the consecration and all the people have responded, they who amongst us are called deacons distribute to each one of those present to partake of the consecrated bread, and of the wine mingled with water, and bear it away to those who are not present."

Ibid., Apol. I. 67 :—

"And the distribution and participation of the consecrated elements take place for each one, and to those who are not present it is sent by means of the deacons."

Calvin's Institutes, IV. xvii. 39 :—

"To what end, therefore, avails the former consecration, the virtue of which does not reach to the sick persons? But those who adopt the practice have the example of the ancient Church. I confess it; but in so important a matter, and in which any error is fraught with great danger, nothing is safer than to follow the truth itself."

Page 239.

Liturgy of S. James :—

"In the night wherein He was betrayed, or rather surrendered Himself, for the life and salvation of the world [here the priest takes the bread into his hands, saying], taking the bread in His holy and pure and spotless and immortal hands, looking up to heaven, and showing it to Thee, His God and Father, He gave thanks, and hallowed, and brake, and gave to His disciples and apostles, saying," . . .

Saxon Confession, Art. XV. :—

"It is also a manifest profanation to carry about and adore a part of the Lord's Supper."

Wurtemburg Confession, Art. XIX. :—

"Another error is that one part of the Sacrament used to be carried about and reserved for the special worship of God. But the Holy

Spirit forbids any worship of God to be instituted without a sure commandment of God."

Page 240.

Scotch Confession, Art. XXII. :—

"Adoration, veneration, carrying about through the streets of the city, reservation of the bread in a pyx or box, are not lawful uses of the Sacrament of the Body of Christ, but mere profanation of the same."

ARTICLE XXIX.

Page 243.

Second Helvetic Confession, Art. XIX. :—

"Meanwhile, as we do not estimate the perfection of the Sacraments from the worthiness or unworthiness of the ministers, so neither do we from the state of the receivers. For we acknowledge that the Sacraments depend for their perfection upon the faith, or truth, and the simple goodness of God. For as the Word of God remains the true Word of God, by which not only bare words are recited when it is preached, but at the same time the things signified or announced by the words are offered by God, although ungodly and unbelieving men hear and understand the words, yet they do not enjoy the things signified, because they do not receive with true faith; so the Sacraments, consisting in word and signs and things signified, remain true and perfect Sacraments, not only because they signify holy things, but because God offers also the things signified, although unbelievers receive not the things offered. This comes to pass not by any fault of God, Who gives or offers, but by the fault of men, who receive without faith and unlawfully, whose unbelief does not make of none effect the faithfulness of God (Rom. iii.)."

ARTICLE XXX.

Page 246.

Council of Constance, Session XIII. :—

"And as this custom was reasonably introduced for avoiding certain dangers and scandals, although in the primitive Church this Sacrament was received by the faithful in both kinds, afterwards by the consecrating priests in both kinds, and by the laity only under the species of bread; since it is most firmly to be believed and by no

means to be doubted that the whole Body and Blood of Christ is truly contained under the species of bread, as well as under the species of wine; wherefore, when a custom of this kind has been reasonably introduced by the Church and the holy Fathers, and has been observed for a very long time, it is to be regarded as a law which we may not reject or change at will without the authority of the Church."

Council of Constance, Session XIII. :—

"Also the holy Synod itself decrees and declares with regard to these matters to the Most Reverend Fathers in Christ, and their lordships the Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops, and Bishops, and their vicars in matters spiritual, wherever appointed, that proceedings are to be instituted whereby it may be committed and commanded unto them by the authority of this sacred Council, under penalty of excommunication, that they effectually punish those who go beyond this decree, who shall encourage the communicating of the people in both kinds, of bread and of wine, and shall teach that it ought so to be done."

Augsburg Confession, Part II. Art. I. :—

"Both kinds of the Sacrament are given to the laity in the Lord's Supper, because this custom has the Lord's command (Matt. xxvi.), 'Drink ye all of it,' where Christ manifestly commanded concerning the cup that all should drink; and that no one might be able to object that this concerns priests only, Paul, writing to the Corinthians, cites an example in which it is clear that the whole Church received in both kinds."

Page 247.

Council of Trent, Session XXI. :—

"Therefore the said holy Synod, taught by the Holy Spirit, Who is the Spirit of wisdom and understanding, the Spirit of counsel and godliness, and following the judgment and custom of the Church itself, declares and teaches that by no divine precept are the laity, and clergy when not consecrating, bound to receive the Sacrament of the Eucharist in both kinds; neither can it by any means be doubted, without injury to faith, that Communion in either one kind is sufficient for them unto salvation."

Page 248.

Ibid., Canon I. :—

"If any one shall say that, by the precept of God, or by necessity for salvation, all and each one of the faithful of Christ ought to receive both kinds of the most holy Sacrament of the Eucharist; let him be anathema."

Council of Trent, Canon II. :—

"If any one shall say that the Holy Catholic Church was not led by just causes and reasons to communicate the laity, and the clergy also when not consecrating, under the species of bread only; or that it has erred in this; let him be anathema."

Ibid., Canon III. :—

"If any one shall deny that Christ whole and entire, the Fount and Author of all graces, is received under the one species of bread, because, as some falsely assert, He is not received in both kinds, according to the institution of Christ Himself; let him be anathema."

Ibid., Session XXII. :—

"Further, whereas the same holy Synod, in the preceding session, reserved until another time, for an opportunity that might occur, two articles to be examined and defined, which had been proposed on another occasion, but had not then as yet been discussed, viz., whether the reasons by which the Holy Catholic Church was led to communicate, under the one species of bread, both laymen and priests when not celebrating, are to be adhered to in such a way that on no account is the use of the chalice to be allowed to any one soever; and whether, if, for reasons that are fair and agreeable to Christian charity, it appears that the use of the chalice is to be granted to any nation or kingdom, it is to be granted under certain conditions, and what are those conditions—the Council, desiring that the salvation of those on whose behalf petition is made may be best provided for, has now decreed that the whole matter be referred to our most holy Lord, as by this present decree it refers it, who of his singular prudence will do that which he shall judge profitable for the Christian commonweal, and salutary for those who petition for the use of the chalice."

ARTICLE XXXI.

Page 250.

Augsburg Confession, Part II. Art. III. :—

"There grew up an opinion which multiplied private Masses to infinity, viz., that Christ by His passion made satisfaction for original sin, and instituted the Mass, in which an offering should be made for daily offences, mortal and venial. Hence arose the common opinion that the Mass is a work blotting out the sins of quick and dead 'ex opere operato.' Here it began to be discussed whether one Mass said on behalf of many has as much efficacy as a separate Mass said on behalf

of each one. This discussion produced that infinite multitude of Masses."

Page 251.

AUGSBURG CONFESSION, Part II. Art. III. :—

"Concerning these opinions, our (preachers) have admonished that they disagree with the Holy Scriptures, and injure the glory of the passion of Christ. For the passion of Christ was the oblation and satisfaction, not only for original guilt, but also for all other sins." . . .

Page 252.

BULLINGER, "Decades," p. 17 :—

"Therefore it remains now undoubted that Christ our Lord is the full propitiation, satisfaction, and sacrifice, and victim for the sins (both for the penalty, I mean, and for the fault) of the whole world; and, moreover, the only one."

Page 255.

JUSTIN MARTYR, "Dialogue with Trypho," Cap. 41 :—

"And the meal-offering, sirs, I said, which was commanded to be offered on behalf of those cleansed from leprosy, was a type of the bread of the Eucharist, which Jesus Christ our Lord commanded us to offer for a memorial of His passion, which He suffered on behalf of men whose souls are purified from all evil."

Page 256.

LITURGY OF S. CLEMENT :—

"Wherefore, having in remembrance His passion and death and resurrection from the dead, and His return again into heaven, and His second future coming, when He shall come with glory and power to judge the quick and the dead, and to render to every man according to his works—we offer unto Thee, our King and God, according to His appointment, this Bread and this Cup, giving thanks unto Thee through Him, that Thou hast thought us worthy to stand before Thee, and to offer sacrifice unto Thee."

Page 257.

LITURGY OF S. JAMES :—

"Therefore we sinners, also, having in remembrance His life-giving passion, His saving Cross, His death, and resurrection from the dead on the third day, His ascension into heaven, and session at the right hand of Thee, His God and Father, and His glorious and terrible second coming, when He shall come with glory to judge the quick and the dead,

when He shall render to every man according to his works—offer to Thee, O Lord, this tremendous and unbloody Sacrifice, beseeching" . . .

Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, Cap. XIV. :—

"But on the Lord's Day do ye assemble and break bread, and give thanks, after confessing your transgressions, in order that your sacrifice may be pure. But every one that hath a controversy with his friend, let him not come together with you until they be reconciled, that your sacrifice may not be profaned. For this is that which was spoken by the Lord: 'At every place and time, bring Me a pure sacrifice; for a great King am I, saith the Lord, and My Name is marvellous among the nations.'"

S. Ignatius, "Ad Philad.," IV. :—

"Take heed, then, to have but one Eucharist, for there is one Flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one cup for the unity of His Blood, one altar, as there is one Bishop, along with the presbytery and deacons, my fellow-servants; so that whatsoever ye do, ye may do it according to the will of God."

Irenæus, "Adv. Haer.," IV., XVIII. :—

"Therefore the oblation of the Church, which the Lord taught should be offered in the whole world, is accounted by God a pure Sacrifice, and is acceptable to Him."

Page 258.

S. Cyprian, Ep. LXIII. :—

"For if Jesus Christ, our Lord and God, is Himself the chief Priest of God the Father, and has first offered Himself a Sacrifice to the Father, and has commanded this to be done for a memorial of Himself, certainly that priest truly discharges the office of Christ who imitates that which Christ did; and he then offers a true and full Sacrifice in the Church to God the Father if he so proceeds to offer it according as he sees that Christ Himself offered."

S. Cyril's Lectures, V. 7, 8 :—

"Then, having sanctified ourselves by these spiritual hymns, we call upon God, the lover of men, to send forth the Holy Spirit upon the gifts lying before Him, that He may make the bread the Body of Christ, and the wine the Blood of Christ, for everything whatsoever the Holy Spirit has touched is wholly sanctified and transmuted. Then, after the spiritual Sacrifice, the bloodless worship, is completed, we beseech God upon that Sacrifice of propitiation for the common peace of the Churches, for the good order of the world, for kings, for soldiers and allies, for those in sickness, for those who are afflicted,

and generally for all in need of succour we all pray and offer this sacrifice."

Council of Nicæa, Canon XVIII. :—

"It has come to the knowledge of the holy and great Synod that, in certain places and cities, the deacons give the Eucharist to the priests, a thing which neither the rule nor the custom has handed down, viz., that those who have no authority to offer Sacrifice should give the Body of Christ to them that offer."

Page 260.

Calvin's Institutes, IV. xviii. 11 :—

"But because I perceive that those ancient writers also wrested this memorial to a use inconsistent with the Lord's institution (because that the Supper, as used by them, presented I know not what appearance of a repeated, or at any rate of a renewed, offering) . . . nevertheless, I think they cannot be acquitted of having committed some error in practice, for they imitated the Jewish manner of sacrificing more nearly than either Christ had commanded, or the nature of the Gospel admitted."

Page 262.

Council of Trent, Session XXII. :—

Canon I.—"If any one shall say that in the Mass a true and proper Sacrifice is not offered to God . . . let him be anathema."

Canon III.—"If any one shall say that the Sacrifice of the Mass is only one of rendering praise and thanks, or that it is a bare commemoration of the Sacrifice accomplished on the Cross, but not a propitiatory Sacrifice; or that it avails the receiver only, and that it ought not to be offered for quick and dead, for sins, punishments, satisfactions, and other necessities; let him be anathema."

Canon IV.—"If any one shall say that blasphemy is cast upon the most holy Sacrifice of Christ, accomplished on the Cross, by the Sacrifice of the Mass, or that it is thereby taken away from; let him be anathema."

Canon V.—"If any one shall say that it is an imposture to celebrate the Mass in honour of the Saints, and for obtaining their intercession with God, as the Church intends; let him be anathema."

Canon VIII.—"If any one shall say that Masses in which the priest alone communicates sacramentally are unlawful, and on that account to be abolished; let him be anathema."

Council of Trent, Session XXII. :—

"Thy holy Synod would wish, indeed, that at each Mass the faithful who are present should communicate, not only in spiritual desire, but also by the sacramental participation of the Eucharist, that thereby a more abundant fruit of this most holy Sacrifice might be derived unto them. Nevertheless, if this be not always done, it does not therefore condemn as private and unlawful those Masses in which the priest alone communicates sacramentally, but approves of and even commends them."

Page 263.

Tetrapolitan Confession, Art. XIX. :—

"And, on the other hand, they who celebrate Masses presume to offer Christ to the Father for quick and dead, and make the Mass to be such a work as that almost by it alone the favour of God and salvation is obtained, howsoever men may either believe or live. Whereupon, also, that shameful and twice and thrice impious traffic in this sacred thing has crept in, and it has come to pass that nothing to-day is more gainful than the Mass. Therefore they have rejected private Masses, because the Lord did command this Sacrament to His disciples in common."

Saxon Confession, Art. XV. :—

"Many before this time have written that in the Mass there is made an offering for quick and dead, and that it deserves remission of sins for him that maketh it, and for others, 'ex opere operato.' . . . By this opinion sacrifices were multiplied, and covetous means of gain increased. Such is the merchandise in Masses and profanation of the Lord's Supper almost throughout the whole world. But God would have corrupt forms of worship reproved and abolished. Therefore we do simply and truly propound the Divine voice which condemns those errors; and with our whole heart we affirm before God, and before the whole Church in heaven and earth, that there was only one Sacrifice of propitiation, or whereby the wrath of the Eternal Father against the whole human race has been appeased, viz., the whole obedience of the Son of God, our Lord Jesus Christ, crucified and risen again."

Wurtemburg Confession, Art. XIX. :—

"Moreover, since the name 'Sacrifice' is capable of very wide meaning, and generally signifies a holy worship, we willingly grant that the true and lawful use of the Eucharist may in this sense be called a Sacrifice. And if the Eucharist be celebrated, according to Christ's institution, in such a way that therein the death of Christ is proclaimed, and the Sacrament of Christ's Body and Blood dispensed to the Church,

it is rightly called an applying of the merit of Christ's passion, to them, that is, who receive the Sacrament."

Page 264.

Second Helvetic Confession, Art. XXI. :—

"What manner of Mass was formerly used by the ancient Fathers, whether tolerable or intolerable, we do not dispute; but this we freely say, that the Mass which is to-day in use throughout the whole Roman Church has been, for many reasons, and those most just ones (which for brevity's sake we do not now mention particularly), abolished in our churches. Assuredly we could not approve it, because of a wholesome action it is made a vain spectacle, also because it is made a matter of gain, or celebrated for money, and because that therein the priest is said to make by consecration the very Body of the Lord, and to really offer the same for the remission of sins, both of quick and dead; add also that it is offered for the honour and commemoration or memorial of the Saints in heaven," &c.

ARTICLE XXXII.

Page 267.

Council of Trent, Session XXIV. Canon IX. :—

"If any one shall say that clergy constituted in sacred Orders, or regulars, who have solemnly professed chastity, are able to contract matrimony, and that when contracted it is valid, the ecclesiastical law or vow notwithstanding; and that the contrary is nothing else than to condemn matrimony; and that all who do not feel that they have the gift of chastity may, even though they have vowed it, contract matrimony; let him be anathema, since God does not deny the gift to them that ask rightly, nor suffer us to be tempted above that we are able."

Page 268.

Augsburg Confession, Part. II. Art. II. :—

"But although there is a plain commandment of God, although the custom of the Church is well known, although impure single life produces very many scandals, adulteries, and other crimes deserving punishment by the good magistrate; nevertheless it is strange that in nothing is greater severity exercised than against the marriage of priests. God commands to honour marriage. The laws in all well-ordered states, even amongst the heathen, have adorned it with very great honours.

But now men suffer capital punishment, and priests too, against the purport of the Canons, for no other cause than because of marriage. Paul calls that a doctrine of demons which forbids marriage (1 Tim. iv.). That can now easily be understood, when the prohibition of marriage is guarded by such punishments."

Tetrapolitan Confession, Art. XII. :—

"Wherefore we could not withstand any one who wished to change the monastic life, which is without doubt a bondage to Satan, for a Christian one; as also we could not withstand others of the ecclesiastical order who have married wives and embraced a kind of life from which more advantage can be expected for their neighbours, and greater uprightness of life, than from that kind of life in which they formerly were. Finally, we have not allowed ourselves to prohibit from the right of marriage those who among us have persevered in the ministry of the Word of God, no matter what chastity they had vowed, for the reasons mentioned, since S. Paul, the chief maintainer of true chastity, admits as bishop a married man."

Page 269.

Bohemian Confession, Art. IX. :—

"They teach also that priests be not engaged in worldly business, but especially that they be free from the state of marriage, that they may be more fit and ready for ministering to the benefit of their neighbour, and of the Church. Moreover, marriage brings with it many hindrances, which prevent many from responding well to their vocation. Wherefore our (preachers) consider celibates to be fit and more suitable for the ministry of the Church, if, that is, this special gift shall have been given to them by God. Not that they think that priests commit sin if they contract matrimony, if necessity warn them, or there be other just reasons for it. For Paul also explicitly teaches that husbands of one wife are to be chosen for undertaking ecclesiastical duties."

Calvin's Institutes, IV. xii. 23 :—

"In one matter they are more than rigorous and inexorable, viz., in not allowing marriage to priests. With what impunity fornication rages amongst them it is unnecessary to say, and emboldened by their polluted celibacy, they have become hardened to all crimes; yet this prohibition clearly shows how pestilent are all their traditions, since it has not only deprived the Church of upright and able pastors, but has introduced a horrible refuse-heap of enormities, and cast many souls into the abyss of despair. Assuredly the prohibition of marriage to priests was an act of impious tyranny, not only contrary to the Word of God, but also to all equity. In the first place, to forbid that which the Lord had left free

was not lawful for men on any account. Secondly, that God had expressly guarded in His Word against infringement of this liberty is too clear for it to be necessary to give long proof."

Saxon Confession, Art. XVIII. :—

"Moreover, we know it is the will of God that marriage should not be prohibited to any persons who are able to marry, and who without marriage would not live without danger to conscience, as it is written. . . . Therefore marriage is allowed amongst us to priests, and other persons, who prefer to live a godly life in marriage, rather than in single life to have wounded consciences, so that they cannot call upon God and live a godly life."

Wurtemburg Confession, Art. XXI. :—

"Moreover, we do not doubt but that they who are true lovers of uprightness think that marriage is free, not only for the laity (as they call them), but also for the ministers of the Church. For the Epistle to the Hebrews says, 'Marriage is honourable in all men, and the bed is undefiled;' and Paul approves marriage in a bishop, and affirms that the prohibition of marriage is a spirit of error and a doctrine of demons. . . . Neither ought a vow of chastity to be a hindrance, because that such a vow, being taken by human superstition, without the authority of the Word of God and contrary to faith, is not acknowledged by God."

Page 270.

Second Helvetic Confession, Art. XXIX. :—

"They who have the gift of celibacy from heaven, so that they can from the heart, or with the whole mind, be pure and continent, and do not grievously burn—let such serve the Lord in that calling as long as they shall feel themselves endued with the Divine gift, and let them not lift up themselves above the rest, but let them serve the Lord earnestly in simplicity and humility. Such, moreover, are more fit for taking charge of Divine things than they who are distracted with the private affairs of a family. But if the gift be taken away again, and they feel a continual burning, let them remember the Apostle's words, 'It is better to marry than to burn' (1 Cor. vii.)."

ARTICLE XXXIII.

Page 272.

S. Ambrose, "De Offic.," II. xxvii. :—

"With grief, also, a putrefying part of the body is cut off, and it is treated for a long time, if it can be healed with medicines; if it cannot,

then it is cut off by a good physician. Such is the affection of a good bishop that he desires to heal the infirm, to remove growing ulcers, to burn away a little, and not to cut off altogether; last of all, with grief to cut off that which cannot be healed."

THEODORET, Ep. LXXVII. :—

"Let them be debarred from partaking of the Holy Mysteries, but let them not be debarred from the prayer of the catechumens, nor from hearing the Divine Scriptures, nor from the counsel of the teachers."

Page 273.

FORM OF EXCOMMUNICATION :—

"And since the aforesaid A. B., conscious of his wrong-doing, has contemptuously refused to appear on the day lawfully named, and has contumaciously withdrawn himself from justice, and has encouraged others by his example to like contumacy; therefore I would notify you of this besides, that our Bishop, in the Name and by the authority of Almighty God, has excommunicated him from all fellowship in the Church of God, and has cut him off from the Body of Christ as a dead member. In this condition is he situated at this time, and in such critical state of his soul. S. Paul, taught by the inspiration of the Spirit of God, bids us flee from the companionship of such men, and from intercourse with them, lest we be partakers in their crime. Nevertheless, as Christian charity moves us, since he has not the will to pray for himself, nor does he understand his danger, let us all pray to God on his account, that he may some day recognise his wretchedness and the uncleanness of his life, and repent, and be turned to God; for our God is merciful, and is able to recover the fallen even from death."

Page 274.

REFORMATIO LEGUM, "De Haeresibus," Cap. 15 :—

"As though excommunication could be understood in any case before that the Church has directed sentence of excommunication against him, in which it is declared that he is to be avoided no otherwise than as a heathen and publican."

S. CYPRIAN, Ep. IV. :—

"God commanded those who did not obey His priests, and those who did not hearken to the judges appointed by Him for the time, to be slain. And, indeed, they were slain with the sword during the time when the circumcision of the flesh was yet in force; but now that circumcision has begun to be spiritual among God's faithful servants, the proud and contumacious are slain with the spiritual sword when they are cast out of the Church."

Page 277.

COUNCIL OF TRENT, Session XXV. :—

"Although the sword of excommunication be the very sinews of ecclesiastical discipline, and very salutary for keeping the people to their duty, yet it is to be exercised soberly and with great circumspection, since experience teaches that, if it be rashly or for trifling causes wielded, it is rather despised than feared, and produces destruction rather than salvation."

Ibid., Session XXV. :—

"But it shall be a crime for any secular magistrate to prohibit an ecclesiastical judge from excommunicating any one, or to command that he revoke an excommunication which has been pronounced, under pretext that the things contained in the present decree have not been observed, since the cognizance of this does not pertain to secular rulers, but to ecclesiastical. But any excommunicate person, if, after the legal admonitions, he does not repent, not only shall not be admitted to the Sacraments, and to communion and intercourse with the faithful, but if, having been bound with censures, he shall, with obdurate mind, remain for a year in the defilement thereof, he may be also proceeded against as one suspected of heresy."

FRENCH CONFESSION, Art. XXXIII. :—

"We think that we ought to follow that which our Lord Jesus Christ appointed concerning excommunication, which indeed we approve, and judge to be necessary, together with its appurtenances."

Page 278.

BELGIC CONFESSION, Art. XXXII. :—

"We therefore reject all human inventions and all laws which are brought into the worship of God, so that consciences are in any way entangled or bound by them. And we receive those only which are fitted either for cherishing and nourishing concord, or for keeping us in obedience to God. But to this end first of all excommunication is necessary, when practised according to the command of God's Word, with other consequent ecclesiastical disciplines belonging to it."

ARTICLE XXXIV.

Page 280.

AUGSBURG CONFESSION, Part I. Art. VII. :—

"Nor is it necessary that human traditions, or rites or ceremonies instituted by men, should be everywhere alike."

Bohemian Confession, Art. XV.:—

"Although, also, our ministers do not observe the rites and ceremonies of all, a thing which is neither possible, nor is it necessary that everywhere in all Churches the same rites and ceremonies should be observed. . . .

"On this point they teach that human traditions ought not to be considered as inviolable and eternal laws; but as they are admitted upon well-ascertained and just causes, so also, upon other causes and circumstances arising which tend in the opposite direction, we may violate them without sin."

French Confession, Art. XXXII.:—

"We believe that it is expedient that those who are chosen to be governors of any Church should investigate among themselves upon what principle the whole body may be conveniently ruled; nevertheless in such a way that they nowhere swerve from that which our Lord Jesus Christ has appointed. But this does not hinder each separate place from having certain peculiar institutions, according as it shall seem convenient."

Page 281.

Second Helvetic Confession, Art. XXVII.:—

"But if in the Churches diverse rites are found, let no one think from this that the Churches disagree. Socrates saith, 'It would be impossible to write down all the rites of the Churches which are throughout countries and districts. No religion observes the same rites, although it embraces the same doctrine concerning them, for even they who are of the same faith differ amongst themselves concerning rites.' . . . But the Churches have always used liberty in rites of this kind, as things indifferent; as we also do to-day."

Page 282.

Saxon Confession, Art. XX.:—

"This is, therefore, the chief rule: It is not lawful for any creature, neither for angels, nor men, nor kings, nor bishops, to frame laws or rites repugnant to the Word of God."

ARTICLE XXXVI.

Page 295.

Council of Trent, Session XXIII. Canon IV.:—

"If any one shall say that by sacred ordination the Holy Spirit is not

given, and that the Bishops do therefore vainly say, 'Receive thou the Holy Ghost,' . . . let him be anathema."

ARTICLE XXXVII.

Page 300.

Reformatio Legum, "De Haeresibus," Cap. 13:—

"Moreover, also, the boorish stupidity of the Anabaptists is to be rejected, who deny that it is lawful for Christians to hold a magistrate's office, as though Christ descended to earth that He might abolish the government of states. Nay, but the Holy Spirit appointed princes and magistrates to be ministers of God, that they may show their favour to good deeds, and restrain evil ones by punishments; and if these two were wanting to human affairs the very greatest confusion would follow in everything."

Page 303.

Ibid., Cap. 21:—

"Wherefore the error of those men is intolerable who will have it that the universal Church of the whole Christian world is contained in the principality of the Bishop of Rome alone."

Page 304.

Submission of Clergy.

The king was recognised as "Singular protector, only and supreme lord of the English Church and clergy, and, as far as the laws of Christ permit, even Supreme Head."

Page 310.

French Confession, Art. XXVIII.:—

"Therefore we condemn the Papistical assemblies, . . . and accordingly we judge that all those who associate themselves with actions of this kind, and communicate with them, separate themselves from the Body of Christ."

Canons of Dort, Preface:—

"This Church, rescued by the powerful hand of God from the tyranny of the Roman Antichrist and the horrible idolatry of the Papacy."

Calvin's Institutes, IV. ii. 12 :—

"Daniel and Paul foretold that Antichrist would sit in the temple of God. The head and leader of that wicked and abominable kingdom amongst us we hold to be the Roman Pontiff."

Ibid., IV. ii. 11 :—

"As, nevertheless, in old time amongst the Jews there remained some peculiar prerogatives of the Church, so to-day we do not take away from the Papists the vestiges of the Church which after their removal the Lord has willed should remain amongst them. . . . So when God had set aside His Covenant in France, Italy, Germany, Spain, and England, where those provinces were oppressed by the tyranny of Antichrist, nevertheless He preserved amongst them, in the first place, Baptism, as a testimony of the Covenant, by which His Covenant might remain inviolable, and this, being consecrated by His mouth, retains its virtue in spite of man's impiety; then by His providence He caused other vestiges of the Church also to remain, that the Church might not utterly perish."

Page 311.

Augsburg Confession, Part I. Art. XVI. :—

"Concerning civil matters, they teach that lawful civil institutions are good works of God; that it is lawful for Christians to exercise a magistrate's office, to pass judgments, to judge matters in accordance with the imperial laws and others that are in force, to appoint punishments in accordance with law, to engage in lawful wars, to take up military service, to contract by law, to hold property, to take an oath when the magistrates so require, and to marry.

"They condemn the Anabaptists, who forbid these civil functions to Christians."

Saxon Confession, Art. XXIII. :—

"Then the justice of God is seen in political government, because He will have open crimes to be punished by the magistrates; and when they who are in authority do not themselves inflict punishment on offenders, God Himself, in a wonderful manner, seizes them for punishment, and proportionately punishes horrible offences with horrible penalties in this life, as it is said, 'He who has taken the sword shall perish by the sword;' and again, 'Whoremongers and adulterers God judgeth.'"

Second Helvetic Confession, Art. XXX. :—

"We condemn the Anabaptists, who, as they deny that a Christian can perform the function of a magistrate, so also deny that any man may be rightly put to death by the magistrate, or that the magistrate can make war, or that oaths should be taken before the magistrate, &c."

Page 313.

TERTULLIAN, Apol. XXXVII. :—

"We are of yesterday, and we have filled all things of yours; your cities, islands, fortresses, towns, courts; your very camps; your tribes and classes; the palace, the senate, the forum; we have left to you your temples only."

ARTICLE XXXVIII.

Page 314.

REFORMATIO LEGUM, "De Haeresibus," Cap. 14 :—

"There is excluded also the community of goods and possessions brought in by the same Anabaptists, which they press so far as to leave nothing of his own to any man. And in this they speak marvellously, since they perceive that theft is prohibited by the Divine Scripture, and see that alms are praised in both Testaments, which we bestow out of our own belongings; but neither of these two things, of course, could be unless the right of having goods and possessions of their own were left to Christians."

Page 315.

BELGIC CONFESSION, Art. XXXVI. :—

"Wherefore we detest the Anabaptists and all turbulent people who reject higher powers and magistrates, overthrow legal rights and judgments, make all goods common, and, in fine, abolish or confound all orders and degrees which, for uprightness' sake, God has appointed amongst men."

ARTICLE XXXIX.

Page 317.

REFORMATIO LEGUM, "De Haeresibus," Cap. 15 :—

"Moreover, neither do the Anabaptists leave the lawful use of oaths; and in this they proceed contrary to the sense of Scripture, and the examples of the Fathers of the Old Testament, as well as the Apostle Paul, nay of Christ, nay of God the Father, whose oaths are often mentioned in the Sacred Writings."

INDEX

A

Absolution, power of, given at Ordination, 296; a Sacramental Ordinance—*See Penance.*

Acolyte, Minor Order, 293

Adaptation, the argument from, 24

Admonition to Parliament (2nd) *quoted* on irresistible grace, 108

Adoption in Baptism, 210, 211

Adrian VI. (Pope) dissuaded from decree on Indulgences, 152

Advent, Christ's Second, 42, 43

A'Lasco, co-operation of, invited by Cranmer, 9

Albertus Magnus, Schoolman, 97 and *n.* 3

Alesius, quoted S. Aug. in debate on Sacraments, 175 *n.* 1

Alexander II. (Pope) attempted to enforce clerical celibacy, 266

Alexandria (Church of) has erred, 133

Alley (Bp. Exeter) on disputes about the Descent into Hell, 36, 37

Almighty, meaning of, 25 and *n.*

Almsgiving a Christian duty, 316

Altar, use of the name, 257, 261, 262; unconstitutional order for demolition of, 306

Ambrose, S., name Confirmation traced to, 186 and *n.* 1; on Ecclesiastical discipline, 272

Anabaptists, condemned by Art. I., 23; and by Art. II., 29, 30; prevalent in Elizabeth's reign, 44; condemned by Art. VII., 53; by Art. IX., 69; by Art. X., 78; by Art. XI., 84; by Art. XV., 101; by Art. XVI., 105; by Art. XVIII., 122; decline of, in England, 126; denied Original Sin and refused Baptism to infants, 213 *n.*, 214, 215; condemned by Augsburg Conf., 216; by Scotch, Belgic, and 2nd Helvetic Conf., 216; by Art. XXXVII., 300; denied lawfulness of capital punishment and of war, 311; condemned by Augsburg and 2nd Helvetic Conf., 311; practised communism, 314, 315; summary of opinions of, 315

Anathema, only once pronounced in XXXIX. Arts., 123; name for Greater Excommunication, 272

Andrëa (of Tübingen) joint compiler of Formula of Concord, 334

Angels, not mentioned in XXXIX. Arts., 3 *n.* 1; forbid veneration of themselves, 161

Anicetus (Pope) receives Polycarp at Rome, 281

Annates, Act for restraint of, 304; its unconstitutional character, 305

Anselm (Abp. Canterbury), gives expression to doctrine of Concomitance, 246 *n.* 1; favoured clerical celibacy, 266

Antichrist thought to be the Pope by Marian Exiles, 309; and by Swiss School of Reformers, 310

Antinomianism, excluded by Art. VII., 54, 58; repudiated by S. Paul, 57; and by Schoolmen, 58; taught by Luther and Melanchthon, 58; prevalent among Anabaptists, 315

Antioch, Church of, has erred, 133

Appeals, Act for restraint of, 304; its unconstitutional character, 305

Apocrypha, meaning of term, 51 *n.* 2; estimation of Books so called, 51, 52

Apollinarianism condemned at Council of Constantinople, 32

Apostles, the, handed on their Mission, 165; provided succession in the Ministry, 166; administered Confirmation, 187; corrupt following of, 199; direct withdrawal from obstinate offenders, 274

Apostles' Creed, expounded in Bishops' Book, 6; history of, 64–67; liturgical use of, 67

Apostolic Fathers do not speak of Table in connection with Eucharist, 262

Aquinas, Thomas, Schoolman, 97 and *n.* 4; on the worship of images, 154

Arianism, excluded by Art. I., 23, 28; prevalent at Reformation, 30; condemned at Council of Nicæa, 32; excluded by Art. V., 44; prevalent in Elizabeth's reign, 44.

Ariminum, Council of, 143

Aristides, Apology of, its testimony to doctrine of Incarnation, 32 and *n.* 2; contains quotation from some form of Creed, 60, 61

Arminianism, censured by House of Commons, 17; holds God's foreknowledge the moving cause of Predestination, 117
Articles, The XI., history and character of, 11, 12
Quotations from:
On Notes of the Church, 130; communion in both kinds, 247; the Mass injurious to Christ's Sacrifice, 251; power of particular Churches to order ceremonies, 280
——, The XLII., not intended as a complete Confession of Faith, 2 *n.* 2; character and authority of, 10, 11; revision of, 13
Quotations from:
On the Descent into Hell, 36; sufficiency of Scripture, 47; disparagement of Scripture by sectaries, 54 grace, 82; Justification, 83; blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, 106; binding force of Moral Law, 125; condition of the departed, 149 *n.*; language to be used in public worship, 169; Sacraments, 174, 175; Infant Baptism, 206; Presence in Eucharist, 218; celibacy of clergy, 265; Homilies, 287; vindication of Prayer Book, 291, 292; civil magistrates, 299; resurrection not yet past, 320; Millenarians, 321; salvation of all at last, 321
——, The XLIII., of Denmark, 330
——, Irish, history of, 334; character of, 351; text of, 351–370
——, Statute of VI., occasion and character of, 7; declared Communion in both kinds unnecessary, 247; upheld celibacy of clergy, 267
——, The X., not intended as complete Confession of faith, 2 *n.* 2; history of, 5, 6; compared with Augsburg Conf., 6; formed basis of Bishops' Book, and of XIII. Arts., 6; in force till publication of King's Book, 7
Quotations from:
On the Three Creeds, 59; Justification, 83; connection of Original Sin with Infant Baptism, 213 *n.*
——, The XIII., history and importance of, 6, 7; source of Art. I., 23; of Art. II., 29; of Art. IX., 68, 69; of part of Art. XXV., 174; of part of Art. XXVI., 201, 202; of part of Art. XXXIV., 279.
Quotations from:
On effect of Baptism upon Original Sin, 75; Justification, 86; ministering in the congregation, 164; theory of Sacramental grace "ex opere operato," 175 *n.* 2; connection of Original Sin with Infant Baptism, 213 *n.*
——, The XXXIX., distinction between, and formularies of foreign Reformers, 2; do not contain whole body of divinity, 2, 3 and *n.*; not intended as a compromise, 3; subscription required to, at Ordination, 3, 4; formerly from graduates, 4; how influenced by Augsburg Conf., 7; history of, 13–15; revision of, attempted by Westminster Assembly, 16 *n.* 2; adopted by Irish Church and by Scotch Episcopal Church, 17; to be assented to on institution to benefice, 17; analysis of, 18; constantly refer to Scripture, 49; treatment of Predestination in, accounted for, 112, 113; contain only one anathema, 123; repudiate Zwinglian view of Sacraments, 180, 183; text of Arts. I.–XV. as revised by Westminster Assembly, 343–348
Ascension of Christ, 41, 42
Athanasian Creed, its definitions of Holy Trinity, 27; date, character, and authorship of, 63, 64; liturgical use of, 67; emphasises necessity of right belief, 123
Athanasius, his part in composition of Nicene Creed, 61, 62
Atonement, doctrine of, 33, 34, 102, 103; sufficiency of, for all, 34, 35, 102 and *n.* 2, 251, 252
Augsburg Confession, compared with X. Arts., 6; allowed Communion in both kinds, 6, 7; and marriage of clergy, 6, 7, 266; condemned vows, 6; formed basis of XIII. Arts., 6; influenced, XXXIX. Arts., 7; condemned private Masses, 7; relation to XLII. Arts., 10; source of Art. I., 23; of Art. II., 29; of Art. IX., 68; contains no Art. on Predestination, 112; source of part of Art. XIX., 127; of part of Art. XXV., 174; of part of Art. XXVI., 202; history and contents of, 329; adopted in Denmark, 330
Quotations from:
On nature of Original Sin, 71; punishment due to Original Sin, 74; condition of man's will since the Fall, 79; Pelagianism condemned, 81; Justification, 85; relation of good works to justifying faith, 91; possibility of falling from grace, 107; Novatian error, 110; Notes of the Church, 127; invocation of Saints, 162; ministering in the congregation, 164; language to be used in the congregation, 171; theory of Sacramental grace "ex opere operato,"

175 *n.* 2; Sacraments not bare signs, 181; private Confession, 193; effect of Sacrament not hindered by unworthiness of minister, 202; Infant Baptism, 216; Real Presence in Eucharist, 231; conservative treatment of the Mass, 232; restoration of cup to laity, 246, 247; multiplication of Masses, 250; the one Sacrifice of Christ, 251, 252; celibacy of clergy, 268; traditions and ceremonies need not be everywhere alike, 280 *n.*; Anabaptist anarchy condemned, 311

Augustine. S. (of Hippo), influence of, traceable in language of Athanasian Creed, 63; Baptismal Creed as given in writings of, 65, 66; language of, adopted in Art. X. 78; influence of writings of, upon the Reformers, 79; on man's will since the Fall, 79; language of, adopted in Art. XII., 93; letter of, to Januarius source of Art. on Sacraments in 1553, 175 *n.* 1; affirms validity of Sacraments unaffected by unworthiness of minister, 204 *n.*; quoted in Art. XXIX., 242 and *n.* 1

Auxerre, Council at, restricted use of reserved Sacrament, 235 *n.* 4

Ave Maria, expounded in Bishops' Book, 6

B

Baptism, effect of, upon Original Sin, 74–76; Regeneration in, implied, 77; sin after, is possible, 106–108; but not unpardonable, 108, 109; requisites for due administration of, 131 and *n.* 1; one of the two Sacraments of the Gospel, 177, 183; Zwingli's view of, 179, 180; a token of allegiance of Christ, 182; an effectual sign of Regeneration, 182; causes of separation of Confirmation from, 187, 188; administered in early times at Easter and Pentecost, 187; significance of the term, 207; manner of performing the act of, 207, 208; a sign of our profession, 208; and of Regeneration, 208, 209; an instrument for grafting into the Church, 209, 210; promises of forgiveness sealed thereby, 210, 211; promises of adoption sealed thereby, 210, 211; work of Holy Spirit in, 211; faith confirmed and grace increased thereby, 212; in early times sometimes postponed, 214 *n.* 3; now generally performed by affusion, 282

Baptism (Infant), growth of practice of, 188; wording of Art. XXVII. altered with reference to, 206; the normal type of Baptism, 207, 213; in view in earlier part of Art. XXVII., 207; expressly defended in Art. XXVII., 212, 213; rejection of, connected with denial of Original Sin, 213 and *n.*; defended in Church Catechism, 214; testimony of primitive Christianity to, 214; compared with Circumcision, 214 and *n.* 1; testimony of N. T. to, 214 *n.* 2; rejected by Baptists, 215; and by Quakers, 215 *n.* 2; retained by Continental Reformers, 215, 216; rejected by Anabaptists, 315

Baptismal Office, implies that the elect = the Baptized, 117; teaches Regeneration in Baptism, 182; enjoins Confirmation, 187; on responsibility of godparents, 188; recognises immersion as normal mode of Baptism, 208; testifies to Regeneration in Baptism, 209; teaches that Baptism grafts into Body of Christ, 210; testifies to remission of sins in Baptism, 210, 211; and to adoption, 211; coincidence of phraseology with wording of Art. XXVII., 212; on qualifications of infants for Baptism, 213, 214

Baptist Confession (1st), *quoted* on irresistible grace, 81

—— —— (2nd)

Quotations from:

On invisible Church, 129; necessity of immersion to due administration of Baptism, 208 *n.* 1; infants not proper subjects of Baptism, 215

Baptists reject Infant Baptism, 215

Barlow, consecration of, denied by Romanists, 292; but beyond reasonable doubt, 293 *n.*

Baro, controversy of, with Whitaker, 16

Basle (1st Confession of), character of, 330

—— (2nd Confession of). *See Helvetic Confession* (*1st*)

Becket (Abp. Canterbury) opposed Henry II., 302

Becon, author of Homilies, 290

Belgic Confession, character of, 332; accepted at Dort, 335

Quotations from:

On sufficiency of Scripture, 47 *n.*; ground of authority of Scripture, 51; nature of Original Sin, 72; relation of good works to justifying faith, 92; invocation of Saints, 162; Sacraments not bare signs, 181; but means of grace, 183; two Sacraments only, 185; Baptism to be administered to infants,

216; the Eucharist, 234; Excommunication, 278; Anabaptist anarchy, 315
Bellarmine, on Counsels of Perfection, 99; Indulgences, 152, 153; worship of images, 154; necessity of intention in ministers, 203 *n.* 2; essentials of Priestly Ordination, 295 and *n.* 1
Benedicite used at Morning Prayer, 52
Benedict XIII. (Pope), his use of reserved Sacrament, 235 *n.* 2
Benediction, Roman rite of, 237 *n.* 2
Benefit of Clergy, abuse of, 294
Berengarius, took part in Eucharistic controversy, 225
Bergem (Book of). *See Formula of Concord*
Bertram took part in Eucharistic controversy, 225
Beza on Royal Supremacy, 9 *n.*
Bishops. *See Episcopacy*
Bishops' Book, history and contents of, 6; acknowledges Seven Sacraments, 184 *n.* 1; compared with King's Book, 336–340
Black Rubric. *See Declaration on Kneeling*
Blackfriars, Council at, condemned Wiclif's doctrines, 202 *n.* 2
Blasphemy (against Holy Ghost), Art. on, struck out, 13, 106; not equivalent to post-Baptismal sin, 108, 109
Bohemian Confession, history and character of, 330
Quotations from:
On relation of good works to justifying faith; 91, 92; celibacy of clergy, 269; traditions and ceremonies need not be everywhere alike, 280 *n.*
Bonner (Bp. London), on effect of Baptism upon Original Sin, 75; contributed to Homilies, 290; objected against legality of Elizabethan Ordinations, 297
Breaking of Bread, early name for Eucharist, 219, 220
Brenz composer of Wurtemburg Conf., 331
Browne (Bp. Harold, of Winchester) on authorship of Homilies, 290 *n.* 1
Bucer, Divinity Prof. at Cambridge, 8; co-operation of, invited by Cranmer, 9; intimacy of, with Cranmer, 112; opposed Hooper, 284; joint compiler of Tetrapolitan Conf., 330; and of Hermann's Consultatio, 331
Bullinger, co-operation of, invited by Cranmer, 9; on completeness of Christ's Sacrifice, 252 *n.*; compiler of 1st Helvetic Conf., 330; and of 2nd Helvetic Conf., 332, 333
Burial Service, implies possibility of falling from grace, 107; on condition of the departed, 148 *n.* 2; testifies to power of Excommunication, 273
Butler (John) on state of religion in Henry VIII.'s reign, 8 *n.* 2

C

Cajetan (Cardinal) on Presence in Eucharist, 231 *n.* 1
Calvin, co-operation of, invited by Cranmer, 10 *n.*; influence of teaching of, in Edward VI.'s reign, 50; emphasises consequences of the Fall, 73 *n.* 2; teaching of, tended to depreciate works, 89; his doctrine of irresistible grace, 108; and of Predestination, 115–120; opinion of, on Zwingli's view of Sacraments, 180; attitude of, towards Episcopacy, 168 *n.*; his doctrine of the Eucharist, 233, 234; treatment of Eucharistic Office, 259 *n.* 3; held Pope Antichrist, 310; composed Consensus Tigurinus, 331; sanctioned French Conf., 332. *See also Institutes.*
Calvinism, prevalent in Elizabeth's reign, 16; holds imputation of Adam's guilt, 72; emphasises consequences of the Fall, 73; holds grace irresistible, 81; emphasises sinful character of works in natural state, 97 *n.* 1; lays equal stress on Predestination and Reprobation, 115, 116; holds God's absolute will moving cause of Predestination, 116, 117; emphasises application of Predestination to individuals, 120; rigid in discipline, 277
Canonical, meaning of, as applied to Scripture, 50
Canons (of 1604), *Quotations from:*
On subscription to Arts., 3, 4; excommunication of those who do not assent to Arts., 17; use of the word congregation, 164 *n.*; Primitive Church as standard, 171; Bishops to confirm at triennial visitation, 187 *n.* 3; practice of Private Confession implied, 192; remarriage of divorced persons forbidden; 196 *n.* 1; directions for Excommunication, 273; denouncing the Excommunicate, 276 *n.* 1
Capital Punishment, lawfulness of, 311
Capito joint compiler of Tetrapolitan Conf., 330
Carlisle, Parliament at, resisted Papal taxation, 303
Carthage, Councils at, condemned Cœlestius, 69; restricted use of reserved Sacrament, 235 *n.* 4
Catacombs, inscriptions in, with prayers

for dead, 151; meetings in, at tombs of martyrs, 158
Catechism, Abp. Hamilton's, character of, 331, 332
——, The Church, teaches that the elect = the Baptized, 117; use of the word "generally" in, 119 *n.*; teaches faith as basis of practice, 123
Quotations from:
On meaning of term Sacrament, 178; Sacraments pledges of grace, 182; Sacraments means of grace, 182; two Sacraments only generally necessary, 183; inward grace of Baptism, 207 *n.*, 209; in Baptism made members of Christ, 210; and children of God, 211; Infant Baptism, 214; inward part of Lord's Supper, 223; two parts in a Sacrament, 226 *n.* 3; purpose of institution of Eucharist, 259 *n.* 2
——, the Holy (of Eastern Church, by Bernardaces). *Quotations from:*
On number of General Councils, 144; number of Sacraments, 184; Unction a Sacrament, 197; traditions, 281 *n.* 1
——, the Holy (of Eastern Church, by Bulgaris), *quoted* on effect of Sacrament not hindered by unworthiness of minister, 203
Causation, argument from, 24
Cecil, desire of, to restore Edward's first Prayer Book, 12; scruples of, in connection with Art. XXIX., 241, 242; Bp. Guest's letter to, 349
Celibacy of clergy, upheld by VI. Art. Law, 7, 267; and by King's Book, 8; history of, 266; upheld by Council of Trent, 267, 268
Ceremonies, power of Church to decree, 135; must not be contrary to Scripture, 137, 282; need not be everywhere alike, 280–282; those who break them to be rebuked, 282, 283; object of, should be edification, 285
Cerinthus, heresy of, excluded by Art. II., 32
Chalcedon, Council of, condemned Eutychianism, 32
Chantries, suppression of, 306
Charlemagne, monastic foundations of, 97
Charles V. (Emperor), Fidei Ratio addressed to, 179 *n.*
Chemnitz joint compiler of Formula of Concord, 334
Cheyney (Bp. Gloucester) objected to Art. XXVIII., 349
Chrism, primitive and Eastern name for Confirmation, 187 and *n.* 1; administered with Baptism, 187; must be consecrated by Bp., 187 *n.* 2
Christ, intercession of, in heaven not treated in Arts., 3 *n.* 2; life and work of, a Revelation of the Father, 24, 25; Resurrection of, 39–41; Ascension of, 41, 42; Second Advent of, 42, 43; office of, as Judge, 43; did more than ratify Moral Law, 58; alone without sin, 102; effect of Death of, 102, 103; objective value of Death of, 124; purpose of, to institute visible Church, 128; sole Mediator between God and man, 159, 160; promised inward grace of Absolution, 189; illustrated nature of Church by parables, 203, 204; we rise with Him to new life in Baptism, 207; significance of His blessing little children, 212, 213; Eucharist a partaking of His Body and Blood, 222–224; Real Presence of, in Eucharist, 227–232; wicked do not partake of, in Eucharist, 243; both kinds administered in Sacrament by ordinance of, 248; completeness of Sacrifice of, 251, 252; presents His Sacrifice in heaven, 254; gave power of Excommunication, 272; directs withdrawal from obstinate offenders, 274; forbids vain swearing, 318; did not refuse an oath, 318
Church, general consent of, the test of Canonicity of Scripture, 49, 50; a missionary institution, 124, 125; a visible Body, 128; notes of, 129–132; authority of, 135, 136; authority of, limited by Scripture, 136, 137; and exercised by General Councils, 139, 140; nature of, illustrated by Christ's parables, 203, 204; evil mingled with good in, 203, 204; men grafted into, by Baptism, 209, 210; has power of Excommunication, 271–273; exercise of discipline necessary to, 276; authority of, with respect to traditions and ceremonies, 282, 283; historical summary of relations with State, 300–306
Churches (particular), liable to error, 133; have power to decree ceremonies, 12, 284
Chytræus joint compiler of Formula of Concord, 334
Circumcision, administration of, to infants an argument for Infant Baptism, 214 and *n.* 1
Civil Power, has right of summoning General Councils, 142; Scripture enjoins obedience to, 300
Clement, S. (of Rome), speaks of Baptized as elect, 117 *n.*; on provision made by Apostles for continuance of ordained ministry, 166 *n.* 1
Clement VIII. (Pope), Pontifical of, 296
Clergy, marriage allowed to, 6, 7, 266,

267; celibacy of, enforced, 7, 8, 267, 268; distinguished from laity, 165; necessity of Ordination for, 165, 166
Cœlestius condemned at Carthage, 69
Commandments, the X., expounded in Bishops' Book, 6
Commination, *quoted* on Primitive Church as standard, 171; on desirability of restoring Primitive discipline, 276
Communicatio idiomatum, meaning of, 33
Communion, Holy, requisites for due administration of, 131; use of term as name for Eucharist, 220, 221; danger of unworthy reception of, 242, 243
—— (in Both Kinds), allowed in Augsburg Conf., 6, 7; rejected in VI. Art. Law, 7, 247; and in King's Book, 8; new Art. upon, 14; rejected by Council of Constance, 143, 246; legalised in Edward VI.'s reign, 247; advocated in XI. Arts., 247; rejected and referred to Pope by Council of Trent, 247, 248; agreeable to Christ's ordinance, 248; objections against, answered, 249
—— Office, alteration in, in 1559, 13; teaches that Eucharist effects Communion with Christ, 182; power of Absolution exercised by priest in, 191; private Confession recommended in, 191; exhortation in, illustrates wording of Art. XXVIII., 224; on danger of receiving unworthily, 242; emphasises completeness of Christ's Sacrifice, 252; testimony of, to Eucharistic Sacrifice, 259, 260; directs case of exclusion to be referred to Ordinary, 275, 276
——, Order of (1548), issued on Royal authority only, 306
Communism, practised by Anabaptists, 314, 315; not necessary outcome of Christianity, 315; nor practice of Primitive Church, 316
Concomitance, doctrine of, 246
Concupiscence, question "Is it sin?" discussed, 75, 76
Confession, the General, emphasises general application of God's promises, 120
——, Private, upheld by VI. Art. Law, 7; place given to, in English Church, 191–193; in Church of Rome, 192 *n.* 1; by Lutheran Reformers, 193; rejected by Swiss Reformers, 193, 194
Confessions of Faith, causes of appearance of, in sixteenth century, 1, 2; table of, 324–328
Confirmation, accounted Sacrament by Roman and Eastern Church, 184; a Sacramental Ordinance, 185; history and doctrine of, 186–189
——, Order of, affirms Confirmation the entrance to full privileges of Church membership, 188; Puritan objections to, with answer of Bps., 189
Congregation, meaning of term in Art. XIX., 129; and in Art. XXIII., 164 *n.*
Congregationalist Declaration of Faith denies authority of Councils, Creeds, &c., 141
Congé d'Élire rendered a mere form by legislation of Henry VIII., 304
Conquest, Norman, effects of, upon relations of Church and State, 301, 302
Consecration of Bps., Romanist objections to form of, 295
Consensus Tigurinus, character of, 331; embodies Calvin's doctrine on Eucharist, 234; separates Regeneration from Baptism, 210 *n.*
Constance, Council of, withheld cup from laity, 143, 246
Constantine the Great, summoned Council of Nicæa, 61; relations of Church and State in time of, 301
Constantinople, 1st Council of, condemned Apollinarianism, 32; Creed accepted at, 62
Constitutions of Clarendon opposed Papal power, 302
Consultatio of Hermann (Abp. and Elector of Cologne), 331
Quotations from:
On Anabaptist theory of human merit, 84; appeal to General Council, 141; connection of rejection of Infant Baptism with denial of Original Sin, 213 *n.*
Controversies (of Faith), authority of Church in, 135, 136
Convocation renounced Papal Supremacy, 303
Coronation Office retains term Altar, 261
Corpus Christi, Festival of, 237 and *n.* 2
Councils, General, conditions constituting, 140; nature of authority of, 140; should be summoned by civil power, 142; liable to error, 142, 143; decisions of, upon things necessary to salvation must be founded on Scripture, 143; table of, 144; four, recognised in England, 144
Counsels of Perfection explained, 99
Courayer rejects Nag's Head fable, 293 *n.* 1
Courts, separation of Ecclesiastical from civil, 302
Cox (Bp. Ely), assisted in revising Arts., 13; held Pope Antichrist, 309
Cranmer (Abp. Canterbury), repudiates compromise in drawing up Arts, 3; change in opinions of, 7, 10, 341, 342; desire of, to unite together those who had broken with Rome, 9 and *n.* 2, 10; his part in compilation of XLII. Arts.,

and testimony as to their authority, 11 and *nn.*; intimacy of, with Bucer and Peter Martyr, 112; on right of civil power to summon General Councils, 142; rejects idea that Sacraments are bare signs, 182 *n.*; testifies to Regeneration in Baptism, 209 *n.* 3; on reverently approaching Lord's Table, 224; on unworthy Communion, 243 *n.* 1; opposed Hooper, 284; author of Homilies, 290
Creation in a sense Sacramental, 179
Creeds, traces of, in N. T., 60; and in Apology of Aristides, 60, 61
——, the Three, the only authoritative statements of doctrine until Reformation, 1; significance of order in which named in Art. VIII., 59; ground of acceptance of, 67; Liturgical use of, 67
Cromwell, patron of Taverner, 290 *n.* 2
Cross, use of, as a symbol, 155
Crucifix, used by Lutherans, 155 *n.* 2; restoration of, in English churches, 155
Cyprian, S., on sufficiency of Scripture, 49; treatment of the lapsed, 110; upheld Infant Baptism, 214; on Eucharistic Sacrifice, 258; Excommunication a spiritual power, 274 *n.* 2
Cyril, S. (of Jerusalem), on prayer for the dead, 150; uses term Mystery to designate Sacraments, 178 *n.*; on Real Presence, 228; Eucharistic Sacrifice, 258
Czengerina, Confessio, character of, 332

D

Deacons, ordination of, 294
Dead, practice of prayer for the, 149–152; reference to, in Communion Office, 152 *n.*
Decades of Bullinger, use of, in England, 252 *n.*
Declaration, His Majesty's, history of, 17; text of, 21, 22; emphasises general application of God's promises, 119
—— on Kneeling, history and import of, 229, 230
Deism excluded by Art. I., 27
Denmark, Episcopacy suppressed in, 168 *n.*
Devay, Lutheran Reformer, 332
Devil only once mentioned in Arts., 3 *n.* 1, 118
Dictate of Pope Hildebrand, 302
Didache *quoted* on manner of Baptism, 208 *n.* 1; Eucharist called Sacrifice in, 257
Directory for Public Worship, treatment of Eucharistic Office in, 260 *n.*
Discipline, administration of, a note of Church, 130, 132; of Primitive Church, 190; should provide for removal of unworthy ministers, 204, 205; subject of discussion in Edward VI.'s reign, 271; Church has power of, 271, 272; three stages in exercise of, 272, 273; imperfectly dealt with at Reformation, 276 and *n.* 2; Scotch Book of, 332
Dispensations (Papal), Act concerning, 304; paved way for spoliation of Church, 305
Divorce inconsistent with Divine institution of Matrimony, 195, 196
Docetism prevalent at Reformation, 39
Doctrine must have express warrant of Scripture, 137
Donatists, held validity of Sacrament affected by unworthiness of minister, 202; condemned in Augsburg and 2nd Helvetic Conf., 202 *n.* 1; conception of, as to nature of Church underlies theory and practice of Baptists, 215
Dort, Synod of, history of, 334, 335
Quotations from Canons of:
On Predestination and Reprobation, 116; moving cause of Predestination, 116, 117; the Pope Antichrist, 310
Dryander, on state of religion in Henry VIII.'s reign, 9 *n.*; co-operation of, invited by Cranmer, 9
Duns Scotus, Schoolman, 97 and *n.* 5; taught Immaculate Conception of B. V. M., 103

E

Eastern Church, estimation of Apocrypha by, 52; acknowledges seven General Councils, 144; agitated by iconoclastic controversy, 155; present usage of, with regard to images, 155 *n.* 1; recognises Seven Sacraments, 184; remarriage allowed to innocent divorced party in, 196 *n.* 1; Unction of sick practised in, 196, 197; holds validity of Sacrament unaffected by unworthiness of minister, 203; practises Reservation, 236 *n.* 1; manner of administering Communion in, 245 *n.*; allows clerical marriage, 266; does not use "traditio instrumentorum," 294
Ebionites excluded by Art. II., 32
Edersheim, testimony of, to Christ's Resurrection, 41
Edward I., opposition to Papal power in reign of, 303
—— III., anti-Papal legislation of, 303
—— VI., marriage of clergy allowed in reign of, 267; Ecclesiastical discipline discussed, 271; controversy on Episcopal vesture, 283, 284; 1st Book of Homilies issued by authority of, 287

and *nn.*; preaching prohibited by, 289; abused Royal Supremacy, 306; used title "Supreme Head," 307 *n.*
Election, Scriptural doctrine of, affirmed in Art. XVII., 113–115
Elevation of Elements of Eucharist, 238–240
Elizabeth, Queen, desired to restore Edward's 1st Prayer Book, 12; added clause to Art. XX. and objected to Art. XXIX., 14; scruples of, in connection with Art. XXIX., 241; effect of Excommunication of, 275; prohibited preaching, 289; refused title "Supreme Head," 299, 307
Ephesus, Council of, condemned Nestorianism, 32
——, Latrocinium of, 143
Episcopacy, retained in England, 167; dispensed with by Continental Reformers, 168; but unwillingly at first, 168 *n.*
Erasmus, on Invocation of Saints, 159, 160
Eucharist, testimony of observance of, to fact of Christ's Resurrection, 41 *n.* 3; one of the two Sacraments of the Gospel, 177, 183; Zwingli's view of, 180; effectual sign of Communion with Christ, 182; Real Presence in, recognised in Art. XXVIII., 218, 219; names given to, 219–222; "Eucharist" Scriptural and Primitive name, 220; a partaking of Christ's Body and Blood, 222, 223; qualifications for partaking, 224; Transubstantiation in, repudiated, 224–227; Real Presence in, 227–231; Lutheran doctrine of, 231, 232; Calvin's doctrine of, 233–235; Reservation of, 235–237; carrying about and worshipping of, 237, 238; elevation of, 238–240; three parts to be distinguished in, 242 and *n.* 3, 243; always has some effect on receiver, 243; Sacrifical aspect of, 254, 255; testified to by Scripture, 255, 256; by Primitive Liturgies, 256, 257; by early Christian writers, 257, 258; by Council of Nicæa, 258; by Prayer Book, 258–262; exclusion from by Excommunication, 272
Eugenius IV. (Pope), gave sanction to doctrine of intention, 203 *n.* 1; affirmed "traditio instrumentorum" necessary at Ordination, 294 *n.* 1
Eusebius (of Cæsaræa) presented form of Creed at Nicæa, 61
Eutychianism, condemned at Council of Chalcedon, 32, 64; excluded by Athanasian Creed, 64
Evening Prayer, power of Absolution exercised by priest in, 191
Ex opere operato, history and meaning of the phrase, 175, 176
Excommunicate persons, attitude of Christians towards, 273, 274; means of restoring, 275, 276
Excommunication, Church has power of, 271–273; two kinds of, 272, 273; sanctioned in O. T., 272 *n.*; form of, 273 *n.* 2; a spiritual power, 274; Papal misuse of, 275; purpose of, 275
Exiles, the Marian, sympathy of, with Swiss Reformers, 12, 13 and *n.*; grieved by lack of discipline, 277 *n.*; held Pope Antichrist, 309
Exorcist, Minor Order, 293
Extreme Unction, accounted Sacrament by Roman Church, 184; a Sacramental Ordinance, 185; history and theory of, 196, 197; a corrupt following of Apostles, 199

F

Fagius, co-operation of, invited by Cranmer, 9
Faith, subjective ground of Justification, 84; means of reception in Eucharist, 233
Fall, Pelagian doctrine of, 70; consequences of, 73
Ferdinand, Emperor, advocated Communion in both kinds, 247
Fidei Ratio, Zwingli's statement of doctrine, 329
Quotations from:
On nature of Sacraments, 179; Baptism, 180
Filioque clause, addition of, to Nicene Creed, 45, 63
Fletcher, C. J. H., admits that Christianity depends on Christ's Resurrection, 40 *n.*
Florence, Council of, continuation of Council of Basle, 144; recognised Seven Sacraments, 184; and validity of Eastern Orders, 294 *n.* 1
Forbes (Bp. Brechin), on authorship of Homilies, 290 *n.* 1
Forgiveness of sins in Baptism, 210, 211
Formula of Concord, history of, 334
Quotations from:
On Original Righteousness, 73; Justification, 85; Real Presence in Eucharist, 232
French Confession, history of, 332
Quotations from:
On sufficiency of Scripture, 47 *n.*; ground of authority of Scripture, 50; result of Original Sin, 73; sinfulness of concupiscence, 76; condition of man's will since the Fall, 80; Justification, 86; Predestination and Reprobation, 116; invocation of Saints, 162; Two Sacraments only, 185; Infant

Baptism, 216; the Eucharist, 234; Excommunication, 277; ceremonies need not be everywhere alike, 280 *n.*; conformity with Rome separation from Christ, 310
Future state implied in Art. IV., 43

G

Gabdiner (Bp. Winchester), on Presence in Eucharist, 231 *n.*; opposed popular opinion of the Mass, 253 *n.*
God, arguments for existence of, 24, 25; nature of, 25; attributes of, 25, 26; relation of, to universe, 26, 27; the efficient cause of grace, 183; said in Scripture to swear, 319
Good Works, new Art. on, at Elizabethan revision, 14; not in themselves meritorious, 89; but pleasing to God in Christ, 90; relation of, to justifying faith, 91–93
Gospel at first orally transmitted, 49
Grace, Art. on, struck out, 13, 82, 126; necessity of preventing and co-operating, 81; held irresistible by Calvinists, 81, 108; importance of doctrine of preventing, 96; possibility of falling from, 106–108
Graduates required to subscribe to Arts., 4, 15
Gregory the Great on use of images, 155
—— VII. (Pope) attempted to enforce clerical celibacy, 266; and to increase Papal power, 302
Grindal (Abp. Canterbury), guilty of irregularity, 167 *n.*; held Pope Antichrist, 309
Grynæus compiler of 1st Helvetic Conf., 330
Guest (Bp. Rochester), assisted in revising Arts., 13; on meaning of Art. XXVIII., 218, 219; text of letter of, on Art. XXVIII., 349, 350
Guilds, suppression of, 306

H

Hamilton (Abp. S. Andrews), Catechism of, 331, 332
Hampton Court Conference, attempt made at, to get Lambeth Arts. authorised, 16
Harpsfield author of Homilies, 290
Heathen, how affected by work of Christ, 124
Hebrews, Epistle to the, emphasises activity of Ascended Christ, 42; doubts as to Canonicity of, 50; dwells on typical character of O. T., 55; alludes to Confirmation, 187
Heidelbergensis, Catechesis, character of, 333; accepted at Dort, 335
Helena, Empress, her Invention of the Cross, 158
Hell, meaning of, in Art. III., 37; Christ's descent into, 37, 38
Helvetic Confession (1st), composition of, 330; *quoted* on Notes of Church, 132
—— —— (2nd), adopted in Hungary, 332; history of 332, 333
Quotations from:
On Atonement, 33 *n.* 2; sufficiency of Scripture, 48 *n.*; ground of authority of Scripture, 51; punishment due to Original Sin, 74; condition of man's will since the Fall, 80; Justification, 86; relation of good works to justifying faith, 92; the Church invisible, 129; authority of General Councils, 141; first four Councils recognised, 145; prayer for dead condemned, 151 *n.* 2; images condemned, 156; veneration of relics condemned, 159; invocation of Saints condemned, 162, 163; language to be used in congregation, 172; Two Sacraments only, 185; private Confession condemned, 193, 194; Unction of sick condemned, 198; Donatists condemned, 202 *n.* 1; removal of unworthy ministers, 205; Infant Baptism, 216; the Eucharist, 235; integrity of Sacrament independent of condition of receiver, 243 *n.* 2; the Mass, 264; celibacy of clergy, 270; ceremonies need not be everywhere alike, 281 *n.*; Anabaptist anarchy condemned, 311
Heresies, revival of, at Reformation, 23 and *n.*
Hermann (Abp. and Elector of Cologne), "Consultation" of, 331
Hermas, "Shepherd" of, speaks of Baptized as elect, 117 *n.*
Henry II. asserted supremacy in Ecclesiastical causes, 302
—— VIII., attempts to ally him with German Protestants, 5; replies to Lutheran censures of English Church, 7; character of Reformation in reign of, 8 and *n.* 2; effect of Excommunication of, 275; prohibited preaching, 289; anti-Papal legislation of, 304; abused Royal Supremacy, 305
Hesse, Episcopacy suppressed in, 168 *n.*
High-Priesthood of Christ, 42 and *n.*, 254, 255
Hilary, S. (of Arles) may have composed Athanasian Creed, 64
Hilles, on prevalence of Arianism, 30; held Pope Antichrist, 309

Holy Spirit, work of, in nature not treated in Arts., 3 *n.* 1; new Art. on, at Elizabethan revision, 14, 44; two-fold Procession of, 44, 45; Divinity of, 45; work of, on those outside Covenant, 96; Art. on blasphemy against, struck out, 13, 106; possibility of losing, 106–108; figures under which spoken of in N. T. 107; special gift of, in Confirmation, 187; work of, in Baptism, 211; special gift of, in Ordination, 296

—— Week, Mediæval ceremonies of, 237

Holywood originator of Nag's Head Fable, 293 *n.* 1

Homilies, referred to in Art. XI., 87; use strong language against images, 155; history of 1st Book of, 287 and *nn.*; history of 2nd Book of, 287, 288; reading of, provided for in Prayer Book, 288 and *n.* 1; meaning of the term, 288; approved in Art. XXXIV., 289; objects of publication of, 289, 290; authorship of, 290; 1st Book of, set forth by Royal authority only, 306

Quotations from:

On Atonement, 33 *n.* 2; Apocrypha, 52; Justification, 87; good works not in themselves meritorious, 89 *n.* 2; relation of good works to justifying faith, 91; respect due to B. V. M., 104; repentance not to be denied to sinners after Baptism, 110; Notes of Church, 130; abuses connected with relics, 156, 157; Primitive Church as standard, 171; meaning of term "Sacrament," 178; number of Sacraments, 184; Matrimony, Absolution, and Orders spoken of as Sacraments, 186, 190; Absolution instituted by Christ, 189, 190; Sacraments to be ministered as Christ did and commanded, 200 *n.*; reception of Christ in Eucharist, 223; abuses of the Mass, 254; taking on oath, 319

Hooper (Bp. Gloucester), on state of religion in Henry VIII.'s reign, 8 *n.* 2; on prevalence of Anabaptism, 30, 101, 106; condemns prayer for the dead, 151 *n.* 3; held Sacraments not bare signs, 180; objected to Episcopal vesture, 283, 284; on Cranmer's opinions, 342

Humphrey, dissatisfied with Art. XXVIII., 219; testifies to lack of discipline, 276 *n.* 2; held Pope Antichrist, 309

Hungary, character of Reformation in, 332

Hypostatic union, meaning of, 33 and *n.* 1

I

Ignatius, S. (of Antioch), speaks of Baptized as elect, 117 *n.*; on Real Presence, 227, 228; speaks of Christian Altar, 257

Images, use of, retained in X. Arts., 6; worship of, condemned in Art. XXII., 146, 147; use and abuse of, 153–156

Immaculate Conception (of B. V. M.), controversy upon, 97 *nn.* 4, 5, 103; declared doctrine of Church, 103, 104; implicitly repudiated in Art. XV., 104

Immersion, in Baptism, 207, 208; held by Baptists necessary to administration of Baptism, 208 *n.* 1

Imposition of hands, the outward sign in Ordination, 165; in Confirmation, 187; in Penance, 190; essential to valid Ordination, 294, 295

Imputation of Adam's guilt, 72; of Christ's righteousness, 85, 86

Incarnation, denied by sectaries at Reformation, 29–31; doctrine of, 31–33; an illustration of Sacramental principle, 179

Indulgences, Romish doctrine of, condemned in Art. XXII., 146, 147; history and theory of, 152, 153

Injunctions of Queen Elizabeth referred to in Art. XXXVII., 307

Quotations from:—

Consecrated Elements in Eucharist called Sacraments, 199 *n.* 2; on authority of Church to order ceremonies, 283 *n.* 1; reading of Homilies, 288; Royal Supremacy guarded from Erastian interpretation, 307, 308

Innocent III. (Pope), granted indulgence to crusaders against heretics, 152; laid England under interdict, 273 *n.* 1; triumphed over King John, 302

Institutes, Calvin's, occasion of, 330

Quotations from:—

On sectaries who disparaged Scripture, 48 *n.* 2; ground of authority of Scripture, 50; disparagement of O. T. by Servetus and others, 54; nature of Original Sin, 72 *n.* 1; effect of Baptism upon Original Sin, 75; Justification, 85, 86; irresistible grace, 108; Predestination and Reprobation, 115, 116; moving cause of Predestination, 116; danger attaching to doctrine of Predestination, 118, 119; application of Predestination to individuals, 120; Notes of the Church, 132; definition of a Sacrament, 181 *n.*; authority of Bps. recognised when not unduly used, 168 *n.*; name "Sacra-

ment" given to Orders, 194 *n.*; Unction of sick condemned, 198; Baptism not merely a sign, 208 *n.* 2; in Baptism men not made sons of God, 211 *n.*; objection to Transubstantiation stated, 226 *n.* 2; Transubstantiation rejected, 233 *n.* 1; Lutheran doctrine of Eucharist rejected, 233 *n.* 3; doctrine of Eucharist, 233 *n.* 4, 234 *nn.* 1, 2; Reservation opposed, 236 *n.* 2; primitive doctrine of Eucharist censured, 260 *n.*; celibacy of clergy, 269; the Pope Antichrist, 310 *n.* 3; Roman Church has some marks of true Church, 310 *n.* 4

Institution of a Christian Man. *See Bishops' Book*

Intention, doctrine of, 203 and *nn.*; of English Church as set forth in Ordinal, 295, 296

Interdict, nature of, 273 *n.* 1

Intermediate State, danger of overlooking, 124; doctrine of, 148, 149

Invocation of Saints, condemned in Art. XXII., 146, 147; theory and practice of, 159–161; condemned by Continental Reformers, 162, 163

Irenæus, Creed as given in writings of, 65; on Real Presence, 228; on Eucharistic Sacrifice, 257

J

James S., Epistle of, doubts as to Canonicity of, 50; Luther's depreciation of, 88, 89; teaching of, on Justification compared with that of S. Paul, 92, 93; quoted in Art. XV., 103; and in Art. XXXIX., 318

Jeremiah quoted in Art. XXXIX., 319

Jerome, S., quoted in Art. VI., 52

Jerusalem, Church of, has erred, 133

Jesus, salvation only in the Name of, 123–125

Jewel (Bp. Salisbury), uses the word wretchless, 118 *n.*; on Real Presence, 229; author of Homilies, 290; on Elizabeth's scruples about title Supreme Head, 299 *n.*; quoted by Bp. Guest, 349

Jews used prayers for the dead, 150 *n.* 6

Joan of Kent, burning of, 30 and *n.*

John ab Ulmis on Cranmer's opinions, 341

——, King, struggle of, with Pope, 273 *n.* 1; a Papal vassal, 302

——, S. (the Apostle), Gospel of, gives prominence to Christ's declaration of the Father, 24, 25; doubts as to Canonicity of 2nd and 3rd Epp. of, 50; 1st Ep. of, quoted in Art. XV., 103; administered Confirmation, 187; directs withdrawal from transgressors, 274

John, S. (the Baptist), advice of, to soldiers, 312

Jude, S., doubts as to Canonicity of Ep. of, 50

Judgment of all men at Last Day, 43

Julius II. (Pope) granted indulgence for contributions to S. Peter's, 152

—— III. (Pope) re-established Council of Trent, 331

Justification, treated in Bishops' Book, 6; meaning of, 84; ground of, 84; Lutheran language upon, departed from in Arts., 10, 86; Homily upon, referred to in Art. XI., 87; as taught by SS. Paul and James, 92, 93

—— by Faith, central doctrine of Lutheranism, 2; emphasised in Art. XI., 84, 87, 88

Justin Martyr, on Real Presence, 228; testifies to use of Reserved Sacrament, 236; his use of ποιεῖν, 255, 256; testifies to Eucharistic Sacrifice, 257

K

King's Book, history and contents of, 7, 8; recognises Seven Sacraments, 184 *n.* 1; compared with Bishops' Book, 336–340

Quotations from:

On possibility of falling from grace, 107; prayer for the dead, 151 *n.* 1; connection of Infant Baptism with Original Sin, 213 *n.*; reading Scripture, 336; prayers in vulgar tongue, 339; free will, 339; Justification, 340

Kiss of Peace, discontinuance of, 282

Knox drew up Scotch Conf., 332

"Kyrie Eleison" testifies that early Liturgy of Rome was Greek, 170

L

Laity, administration of cup to (*see Communion in both kinds*); distinguished from clergy, 165

Lambeth Articles, history and significance of, 16; incorporated in Irish Arts., 16 *n.* 1; 334

Quotations from:

On irresistible grace, 108; Predestination and Reprobation, 116; moving cause of Predestination, 116

Lanfranc (Abp. Canterbury) took part in Eucharistic controversy, 225 *n.*

Langton (Abp. Canterbury) defied Papal authority, 303

Lapsed, controversy as to treatment of, 110

Lateran Council (4th), defined Transubstantiation, 1, 143, 225; required clerical celibacy, 266
Latimer (Bp. Worcester), denies that Sacraments are bare signs, 181; on Real Presence, 229
Latin, use of, in public worship accounted for, 169
Latitudinarian opinions anathematised, 123
Laud (Abp. Canterbury) drew up His Majesty's Declaration, 17
Laurence (Abp. Dublin) shows Lutheran influence upon Art. XVII., 113 *n.* 2
Law of Moses, how far binding upon Christians, 56–58; Law of Christ goes far beyond, 58; allowed Divorce, 195, 196
Lector, Minor Order, 293
Leo the Great (Pope), directions of, for private Confession, 190 *n.* 2
—— IX. (Pope) attempted to enforce clerical celibacy, 266
—— X. (Pope) granted Indulgence for contributions to S. Peter's, 152
Lessons appointed from Apocrypha, 52; and from O. T., 56
Liguori author of "Glories of Mary," 161 and *n.* 2
Lingard rejects Nag's Head Fable, 293 *n.* 1
Litany, omission of prayer against Pope in, 308
Liturgies, the ancient, contain prayers for the dead, 150; direct elevation in Eucharist, 238, 239 and *n.*; testimony of, to Eucharistic Sacrifice, 256, 257
Liturgy, use of term as a name for the Eucharist, 222
Lombard, Peter, limited name 'Sacrament' to Seven Ordinances, 184
Lord's Day, testimony of observance of, to Christ's Resurrection, 41 *n.* 3
—— Prayer expounded in Bishops' Book, 6
—— Supper, history of title as applied to the Sacrament, 221
Lorraine, Cardinal of, advocated Communion in both kinds, 247
Luther, Antinomianism of, 58; on condition of man's will since the Fall, 80; protested against theories of human merit, 84; depreciated works, 88, 90 *n.* 2; Predestination not prominent with, 112; opinion of, on images, 155 *n.* 2; on Zwingli's view of Sacraments, 180; on Presence in Eucharist, 232; opposed Communion in one kind, 246 and *n.* 2; and celibacy of clergy and vows, 268; wrote preface to Bohemian Conf., 330
Lutheran Reformers, negotiations between English and, 5–7, 267; dispensed unwillingly with Episcopacy, 168 and *n.*; treat of Two Sacraments only, 184, 185; on Presence in Eucharist, 231, 232; upheld power of Excommunication, 277

M

Macedonius, teaching of, condemned at 1st Council of Constantinople, 62
Magistrate, authority of, hurt by breach of Ecclesiastical traditions, 283; has power of capital punishment, 311; may command military service, 312; and exact an oath, 318, 319
Magna Charta, anti-Papal character of, 303
Marburg, Conference at, 180 *n.* 3, 232; Arts. drawn up at, 329
Marriage, allowed to priests in Augsburg Conf., 6, 7, 266; accounted Sacrament in Roman and Eastern Church, 184; a Sacramental Ordinance, 185; called Sacrament in Homilies, 186; aspects of, dwelt on in Scripture and Marriage Service, 195, 196; state of life allowed in Scripture, 199; allowed to clergy in Edward VI.'s reign, 267; and in Scripture, 267
Mary, Queen, prohibited preaching, 289; Ordinal repealed in reign of, 297; abused Royal Supremacy, 306
Mass, supposed effectual for souls in Purgatory, 147; use of the term as title of Eucharist, 222; popular opinion of, condemned, 253, 254
Mediator, Christ the only, 55; His sole Mediatorship obscured by Invocation of Saints, 159, 160
Melancthon, co-operation of, invited by Cranmer, 9 *n.* 2, 10; inclined to Antinomianism, 58; on effect of Baptism upon Original Sin, 75; influence of teaching of, upon Art. XVII., 113; recognised Penance as Sacrament, 177 *n.*; wished to retain Episcopacy, 168 *n.*; approximated to Calvinistic doctrine on Eucharist, 235; chief compiler of Augsburg Conf., 329; editor of Conf. Variata, 331; joint compiler of Hermann's "Consultatio," 331; editor of Saxon Conf., 331
Merit (of Christ) ground of Justification, 84
—— (human), theories of, repudiated, 84; "*de condigno*," 89 and *n.* 3, 95; "*de congruo*," 95
Micronius on prevalence of heresies, 30; on disputes about the Descent into hell, 36
Military Service, lawfulness of, 312, 313
Mill, J. S., on argument from adaptation, 24

Millenarian opinions, Art. against, struck out, 14, 126; held by Anabaptists, 315; condemned in XLII. Arts., 321
Ministers, Ordination necessary for, 164–168; unworthiness of, does not hinder effect of Sacraments, 202–204; to be deposed when found guilty, 204, 205
Ministry, the Threefold, by succession from the Apostles, 166 and *n.* 2; conditions of lawful, 167
Minor Orders, 293, 294
Monasteries centres of learning, 97; suppression of, 304, 305
Moral Law, binding force of, 56–58, 125, 126
Morning Prayer, power of Absolution exercised by priest in, 191
Morrison, John, Presbyterian, licensed to officiate in England, 167 *n.*
Moses, called Mediator, 55
Münster, Anabaptist excesses at, 315
Myconius, compiler of 1st Helvetic Conf., 330
Mystery, a name for Sacraments, 178; used in pl. for Eucharist only, 199 *n.* 2

N

Nag's Head Fable now given up, 293 *n.* 1
National Church, power of, to decree ceremonies, 12, 284
Neale, Dr. J. M., on date of Liturgies, 256
Necessary Doctrine for any Christian man. *See King's Book*
Nestorianism condemned at Council of Ephesus, 32
Nicolas II. (Pope), attempted to enforce clerical celibacy, 266
Nicæa, Council of, condemned Arianism, 32; assumes Eucharistic Sacrifice, 258; prohibited clerical second marriages, 266
——, 2nd Council of, allowed use of images, 155
Nicene Creed, history of clauses relating to Holy Spirit in, 45; composition of, 61–63; liturgical use of, 67; connects remission of sins with Baptism, 210
Nominalists, 97 and *nn.*
Novatian, rigorous discipline of, revived by some at Reformation, 110

O

Oaths refused by Anabaptists, 315; rash ones forbidden, 318; before magistrate not to be refused, 318, 319
Offertory Sentences from Apocrypha, 52
Old Testament, disparagement of, by sectaries at Reformation, 53, 54; unity and vital connection of, with N. T., 54, 55; value of, emphasised by English Church, 56; excommunication sanctioned in, 272 *n.*
Olevianus, joint compiler of Cat. Heidelbergensis, 333
Orders, acknowledged Sacrament by Roman and Eastern Church, 184; have Sacramental nature, 185; called Sacrament in Homilies, 186; the outward sign and inward grace of, 194; Romanists deny validity of English, 292, 293
Ordinal (of 1550) contains all things necessary, 292–296; compared with Pontifical, 293, 294; retained "*traditio instrumentorum*," 294 *n.* 2; form of consecrating Bishops in, 295 *n.* 2; contains nothing superstitious or ungodly, 296; objection against legality of, 297
——, The, *quoted*, on Notes of Church, 130; the Threefold Ministry, 166; necessity of Episcopal Consecration and Ordination, 167; Primitive Church as standard, 171; power of Absolution given to priests in, 190, 191; connects inward grace with outward sign, 194; Preface to, testifies to intention of English Church, 295; addition made to form of consecrating Bishops in, 295 *n* 2
Ordinary, exclusion from Communion to be referred to, 275
Ordination, necessity of, for clergy, 165; necessity of Episcopal, 167; power of Absolution given to priests at, 190, 191, 296; special gift of Holy Ghost in, 296
Origen on private Confession, 190 *n.* 1
Original Righteousness, history of expression, 68, 69, 73 *n.* 1
—— Sin, connection of, with Infant Baptism, 70, 213 *n.*; nature of, 71, 72; extent of, 72; result of, 73; punishment due to, 74; effect of Baptism upon, 74–76
Ornaments Rubric, insertion of, 13; testimony of, to Eucharistic Sacrifice, 260, 261; text of, 260 *n.* 2
Orthodox Confession, Eastern Church, *quoted* on Procession of Holy Spirit, 45 *n.* 2; Scripture and tradition, 48 *n.* 1
Ostiarius, Minor Order, 293

P

Pantheism excluded by Art. I., 26
Papal Bull "Ineffabilis" *quoted* on Immaculate Conception, 103
—— Supremacy. *See Supremacy*
Paphnutius opposed enforcement of clerical celibacy, 266
Parables of Christ on nature of Church, 203, 204

Pardons. *See Indulgences*
Parliament, 2nd Admonition to, 108; marriage of clergy sanctioned by, 267; resisted Papal taxation, 303; anti-Papal legislation of, at Reformation, 304
Parker (Abp. Canterbury), circulated XI. Arts., 12; wished to restore 1st Prayer-Book of Edward, 12; revised XLII. Arts., 13; on prevalence of heresy, 44; validity of Consecration of, questioned, 292, 293 *n.*
Parkhurst (Bp. Norwich) on Elizabeth's refusal of title "Head" of Church, 299 *n.*
Paschal Controversy, 281
Paschasius, deacon of Rome, testifies to use of name Confirmation, 186 *n.* 2
Paul, S. (Apostle), teaching of, on Moral Law, 56–58; on Justification, 84; on Justification compared with teaching of S. James, 92, 93; Pastoral Epp. of, testify to Threefold Ministry, 166 *n.* 2; on Baptism as token of allegiance to Christ, 181, 182; administered Confirmation, 187; quoted in Art. XXV., 199; implies Real Presence in Eucharist, 244; has married clergy in view, 267; exercised power of Excommunication, 272; directs withdrawal from obstinate offenders, 274; on attitude of Christians towards civil power, 300, 301; calls God to witness the truth, 318
Paul III. (Pope) makes overtures for Council, 330
Peace Offering typical of Eucharist, 239
Pearson (Bp. Chester), on interpretation of 1 Ep. S. Peter, 37 *n.* 2
Pelagianism, prevalent at Reformation, 23 *n.*, 69; condemned by Art. IX., 69; and by Art. X., 78, 81; and by Art. XIII., 94; and by Augsburg Conf., 81; review of, 69–71; taught possibility of sinlessness, 90
Penance, expressly excluded from Sacraments in 1563, 177; accounted Sacrament in X. Arts. and by Lutheran Reformers, 177 *n.*; and by Roman and Eastern Church, 184; a Sacramental Ordinance, 185; called Sacrament in Homilies, 186; history of, and place in English Church system, 189–193; in Lutheran system, 193; rejected by Swiss Reformers, 193, 194; the means of restoring the Excommunicate, 275
Peter, S. (Apostle), on the Descent into Hell, 37; doubts as to Canonicity of 2nd Ep. of, 50; an example of restoration of penitent, 110; administered Confirmation, 187
—— Martyr, Divinity Prof. at Oxford, 8; co-operation of, invited by Cranmer 9, 112; on Predestination, 112; opposed Hooper, 284; on Cranmer's opinions, 342
Peter's Pence, Act concerning, 304
Philpot (Archdn.), evidence of, as to authority of XLII Arts., 11 *n.* 1
Pirminius, form of Creed in writings of, 64
Pius IV. (Pope), Creed of, 333
Quotations from:
On Scripture and tradition, 137; the Seven Sacraments, 184
—— IX. (Pope) decreed Immaculate Conception of B. V. M., 103
Poinet (Bp. Winchester), Catechism of, prefixed to XLII. Arts., 11 *n.* 3
Poland, character of Reformation in, 333
Polycarp, S., martyrdom of, 158; visit of, to Rome, 281
Polytheism, excluded by Art. I., 27; resulted from invocation of Saints, 159
Pontifical compared with Ordinal, 293, 294
Pope, Alex. (the poet), gives expression to Latitudinarian spirit, 123
Postils, sermons by Taverner, 290 and *n.* 2
Præmunire, Statutes of, 303
Prayer, public, to be said in language understood, 170
Prayer-Book (of 1549), character of, 8, 9 and *n.* 1; anointing of sick retained in, 197; Reservation retained in, 236; elevation in Eucharist forbidden in, 238; provided Communion in both kinds, 247; and for reading of Homilies, 288
—— —— (of 1552), character of, 9; Unction of sick discontinued in, 198; Reservation discontinued in, 236; prohibition of elevation in Eucharist withdrawn in, 238; provided Communion in both kinds, 247; Eucharistic Office mutilated in, 260 *n.* 1; vestments of minister as provided in, 261 *n.*; provided for reading of Homilies, 287 *n.* 3
—— —— (of 1559), character of changes in, 12, 13; Elements in Eucharist called Sacraments in, 199 *n.* 2; Ornaments Rubric inserted in, 260 and *n.* 2; provided for reading of Homilies, 288 and *n.* 1; change in Litany in, 308
—— —— (of 1560), Reservation permitted in, 236
—— —— (of 1661), purport of rubric in, ordering consumption of Sacrament, 237; testimony of, to Eucharist Sacrifice, 258–262; on power of National Churches to decree ceremonies, 284, 285
Prayer-Oil, Eastern name for Unction of sick, 184, 196
Preachers, lack of, at Reformation, 289
Preaching, qualifications for public, 165–167

Predestination, central doctrine of Calvinism, 2; fundamental importance of, with "Reformed" theologians, 112; Scriptural doctrine of, laid down in Art. XVII., 113–115; moving cause of, 116, 117; practical results of doctrine of, 118, 119; Art. XVII. repudiates doctrine of, as applied to individuals, 119, 120
Presbyterian Orders irregularly recognised, 167 *n.*
Presence, the Real, in Eucharist, affirmed in Art. XXVIII., 218, 219, 227; history of doctrine of corporal, 224–226; testimony of Primitive Church to, 227, 228; testimony of English Reformers to, 228, 229; a spiritual Presence, 230, 231; Lutheran doctrine of, 231, 232; implied in writings of S. Paul, 244
Priest, use of the term, 261 *n.* 2; essentials for Ordination of, 294, 295
Primitive Church, attitude of, towards images, 154, 155; custom of, taken as standard, 170, 171; penitential discipline of, 190; practised Reservation, 236; relations of, with the State, 300, 301
Private judgment not to be set up against Church authority, 282, 283
—— Masses condemned in Augsburg Conf., 7; allowed by VI. Art., Law 7; not encouraged by Council of Trent, 262
Privy Council, unconstitutional action of, in Edward VI.'s reign, 306
Processions of the Sacrament, 237 and *n.* 1
Promises of God of general application, 119, 120
Provisors, Statute of, 303
Prussia, Episcopacy eventually abandoned in, 168 *n.*
Purgatory retained in X. Arts., 6; treated in Bishops' Book, 6; Romish doctrine of, condemned in Art. XXII., 146, 147; Romish doctrine of, stated, 147, 148
Puritans, objections of, to Order of Confirmation, 189; to Ornaments Rubric, 261 *n.* 1; to reading of Homilies in church, 288 and *n.* 2; and to Ordinal, 296

Q

Quakers, opinions of, revived Anabaptism, 317 *n.*
——, Principles of Religion as professed by
Quotations from:
On Baptism and Communion, 132 *n.*; on Infant Baptism, 215 *n.* 2

R

Rabanus Maurus, took part in Eucharistic controversy, 225
Raccolta contains invocations of Saints, 161
Radbert on Presence in Eucharist, 224
Ratification added to XXXIX. Arts., 320
Realists, 97 and *nn.*
Reformatio Legum, history and value of, 15
Quotations from:
On prevalence of Arianism, 30, 31; Anabaptist disparagement of O.T., 53, 54; nature of Original Sin, 71; condition of man's will since the Fall, 79; liability of regenerate to sin, 101; sin after Baptism, 105, 106; general application of God's promises, 119; declared will of God to be followed, 120; Latitudinarian opinions, 122; Notes of Church, 132; errors of Roman Church in faith and morals 133; General Councils, 140; condition of the departed, 149 *n.*; Sacraments not bare signs, 181; number of Sacraments, 183; absence from Communion on ground of unworthiness of minister condemned, 202; Infant Baptism, 215; objections to Transubstantiation, 226 *n.* 1; attitude of Christians towards the Excommunicate, 274 *n.* 1; Anabaptist anarchy, 300; Papal supremacy repudiated, 303 *n.*; Anabaptist communism condemned, 314, 315; Anabaptist rejection of oaths condemned, 317
Reformation, causes of, 1
Regeneration in Baptism, implied in Art. IX., 77, 209 *n.* 2; testified to in Baptismal Office, 209; and by English Reformers, 209 *n.* 3; separated from Baptism by Swiss Reformers, 209 *n.* 3
Relics, worship of, condemned in Art. XXII., 146, 147; the use and abuse of, 156–159
Remonstrants, Confession of the, *quoted* on the moving cause of Predestination, 117
Repentance not to be denied to sinners after Baptism, 109, 110
Reprobation, an integral part of Calvinism, ignored in Art. XVII., 115
Reservation of the Sacrament, history and proper use of, 235–237
Resurrection of Christ, 39–41
—— of all men not expressly treated in Arts., 3 *n.* 1; but implied in Art. IV., 43

Revelation of S. John, emphasises activity of ascended Christ, 42; doubts as to Canonicity of, 50
Réville explains away Christ's Resurrection, 41 *n.* 1
Richard II., anti-Papal legislation of, 303
Ridley (Bp. London), testifies to revival of heresies, 23 *n.*; to gift of grace of Holy Spirit in Baptism, 209 *n.* 3; to grafting into Body of Christ by Baptism, 210 *n.* 1; on Real Presence, 228, 229; on worship due to Christ present in the Sacrament, 238; on Eucharistic Sacrifice, 259 *n.* 1; opposed Hooper, 284
Roman party, action of, in Elizabeth's reign, 241 and *n.*; grounds of objection of, to validity of English Orders, 292, 293
Romanenses, use of the term, 146 *n.*
Romans, Epistle to the, teaching of, on Justification, 93
Rome, Church of, has erred, 127, 133; at first a Greek-speaking Church, 170
Romish doctrine, significance of the expression, 146, 147
Rufinus of Aquileia, forms of Creed in writings of, 66
Rule of Faith, as laid down in X. Arts., 5; in XXXIX. Arts., 49

S

Sabellianism excluded by Art. I., 23, 27, 28
Sacrament, meaning of the term, 177, 178; use of pl. in reference to Eucharist alone, 199
Sacraments, number of, 5, 6; their institution evidence of Christ's purpose to found visible Church, 128; administration of, a Note of Church, 131; necessary qualifications for administering, 165–167; to be administered in language understood, 170; doctrine that they take effect '*ex opere operato*' condemned in XLII. Arts., 175; but not in XXXIX. Arts., 176; may be dispensed with by God, but not by man, 176 *n.*; the Sacramental principle, 178, 179; not bare signs, 179–181; badges of profession, 181, 182; witnesses and effectual signs of grace, 182; by them God works in us, 182, 183; and quickens and confirms our faith, 183; number of, 183–185; ordained to be duly used and worthily received, 199, 200; validity of, unaffected by unworthiness of minister, 202, 204
Sacrifice of Christ, 34, 102, 103; objective value of, for men, 124; unique character of, 251, 252; obscured by Masses, 253, 254
Sacrifice, Eucharistic, not condemned by Art. XXXI., 253. *See Eucharist*
Saints, prayers to, retained in X. Arts. 6. *See Invocation*
Sampson, dissatisfied with Art. XXVIII., 219; testifies to lack of discipline, 276 *n.* 2; held Pope Antichrist, 309
Sandomir, Consensus of, 333
Savonarola, use of Reserved Sacrament on behalf of, 235 *n.* 3
Savoy Conference, refused to omit Ornaments Rubric, 261 *n.* 1; objection made to Homilies at, 288 *n.* 2
Saxon Confession, history, of 331
Quotations from:
On results of the Fall, 73; sinfulness of concupiscence, 76; condition of man's will since the Fall, 80; Justification, 85; merit *de condigno*, 89 *n.* 3; possibility of falling from grace, 107; the Church visible, 128; images, 156; invocation of Saints, 159 *n.* 1, 162; Sacramental grace not '*ex opere operato*,' 175 *n.* 2; Sacraments not bare signs, 181; Confirmation, 188; private Confession, 193; remarriage allowed to innocent divorced party, 196 *n.* 1; Unction of sick condemned, 198; Infant Baptism, 216; Real Presence, 231; conservative treatment of Mass, 232; practices connected with Eucharist, 239; Sacrifices of Masses condemned, 263; marriage allowed to clergy, 269; ceremonies not to be contrary to Scripture, 282 *n.* 1; power of magistrate to inflict punishment, 311
—— Kings of Engand exercised supremacy in Ecclesiastical causes, 301
Schism between East and West, 45
Schmalkald Articles, history of, 330, 331
Quotations from:
On error that regenerate cannot sin, 105; abuses connected with relics, 156
Schoolmen, opposed Antinomianism, 58; doctrine of, on human merit, 95; history and theories of, 97 and *nn.*; some of, taught works of Supererogation, 98; and Counsels of Perfection, 99; their use of the phrase '*ex opere operato*,' 175, 176; theory of, with regard to Unction of sick, 197; speculations of, underlie Transubstantiation, 225, 226; consider '*traditio instrumentorum*' necessary to priestly ordination, 294
Schwabach Articles, 329
Schwenkfeld held a form of Docetism, 39

Scotch Confession, history of, 332
Quotations from:
On sufficiency of Scripture, 47 *n.*; ground of authority of Scripture, 51; result of Original Sin, 73; the Church invisible, 129; Notes of Church, 132; authority of General Councils, 141; Sacraments not bare signs, 181; Two Sacraments only recognised, 185; Infant Baptism, 216; the Eucharist, 234; practices connected with Eucharist, 240
Scotus, Johannes, took part in Eucharistic controversy, 225
Scripture, use of, restricted by Kings' Book, 8; contains all things necessary to salvation, 47, 48, 143; authority of, disparaged by sectaries, 48; significance of position of Art. upon, 48; sufficiency of, 49; constantly referred to in Arts., 49; ground of acceptance of, 49; Predestination as taught in, 113, 114; will of God set forth in, for our guidance, 120; relation of, to the Word preached, 131; and to the authority of the Church, 136, 137; contains prayer for the dead, 150; testifies that language understood should be used in congregation, 170; aspects of Matrimony dwelt upon in, 195; testimony of, to Eucharistic Sacrifice, 255, 256; enjoins obedience to civil power, 300, 301; regarded as unnecessary by Anabaptists, 315
Seal, a primitive name for Confirmation, 187
Servetus, denied vital connection of Judaism with Christianity, 54
Sick, Order of Communion of, *quoted* on spiritual Communion, 176 *n.*
Sin, criticism of Pelagian doctrine of, 70, 71; after Baptism possible, 106–108; but not unpardonable, 108, 109
Socinianism, excluded by Art. I, 28; supposes Christ born in sin, 72
Socinus on Baptism, 210 *n.* 2
Soldiers, calling of, not unlawful, 312, 313
Son of God, work of, in Creation not treated in Arts., 3 *n.* 1; nature of, 31; Incarnation of, 31–33; Eternal Generation and Incarnation of, illustrate Sacramental Principle, 178, 179
Spencer, Herbert, on argument from causation, 24
Spoliation of Church by Tudor Sovereigns, 305, 306
State, historical summary of relation of, to Church, 300–306
Strauss, admits that Christianity falls with Christ's Resurrection, 40 *n.*; explains away Christ's Resurrection, 41
Subdeacon, Minor Order, 293
Submission of Clergy, provided for revision of Canon Law, 15; gave to Henry VIII. title "Supreme Head," 304, 305
Subscription to Articles enforced by Parliament, 15
Supererogation, Works of, condemned by Art. XIV., 98; meaning of the term, 98; doctrine of, is arrogant and impious, 99, 100; effectual in shortening purgatorial pains, 147, 148; form a treasury of merit, 152
Supremacy, Papal, rejected in X. Arts., 5; and in Art. XXXVII., 300; efforts of Gregory VII. to establish, 302; opposed by Constitutions of Clarendon, 302; exercised by Innocent III., 302; opposed by Magna Charta, 303; and by fourteenth century legislation, 303; repudiated at Reformation, 303–305; held anti-Christian by Marian exiles, 309; and by Swiss Reformers, 310
——, Royal, laid down in X. Arts., 5; modified by Q. Elizabeth, 299; asserted in Art. XXXVII., 300; exercised in Saxon times, 301; how used by William I., 301, 302; how exercised during Middle Ages, 302, 303; asserted by Henry II., 302; abused by Henry VIII. and Edward VI., 305, 306; and by Q. Mary, 306; guarded by Q. Elizabeth, 306–308
Supreme Head, title dropped by Q. Elizabeth, 299, 307; Act of, 304; title used by Q. Mary, 306; and by Edward VI., 307 *n.*
Sweden, Episcopal arrangements retained in, 168 *n.*
Swiss School of Reformers held Scripture self-authenticated, 50, 51; condemned prayer for the dead, 151; forbade images, 155; opposed preservation of relics, 159; dispensed with Episcopacy, 168; admit two Sacraments only, 185; influence of, seen in Irish Arts., 351

T

Table, the Lord's, use of the name, 259, 262
Taverner, "Postils" of, 290 and *n.* 2
Teaching of the Twelve Apostles. *See Didache*
Tertullian, form of Creed in writings of, 65; opposed Infant Baptism, 214 and *n.* 4; testifies that Christians served in the army, 313 *n.*
Tetrapolitan Confession, history and character of, 330
Quotations from:
On sufficiency of Scripture, 47 *n.*; relation of good works to justifying faith, 91; use of images, 156;

invocation of Saints, 162; private Confession condemned, 193; Infant Baptism, 216; Sacrifices of Masses, 263; celibacy of clergy, 268
Theban legion, story of, 313 *n.*
Theodore of Tarsus (Abp. Canterbury), Penitential of, 190 *n.* 2; organises English dioceses, 301 *n.*
Theodoret on Excommunication, 272
Thiers on Exposition of the Sacrament, 237 *n.* 1
Thundering legion, story of, 313 *n.*
Timothy, nature of office held by, at Ephesus, 166 *n.* 2
Titus, nature of office held by, in Crete, 166 *n.* 2
Toledo, Council of, accepted double Procession of Holy Spirit, 45, 63
Tonstal (Bp. Durham), replied to Lutheran censures of English Church, 7
Torgau, Arts. drawn up at, 329
Traditio Instrumentorum, ceremony connected with Ordination of priests, 294
Traditions need not be everywhere alike, 280, 281; meaning of term, 281 and *n.* 1; must not be contrary to Scripture, 282; rebuke due to those who break, 282, 283
Traheron on Cranmer's opinions, 341, 342
Transubstantiation, defined at 4th Lateran Council, 1, 225; affirmed by VI. Art. Law, 7; history of, 224–226; repudiated in Art. XXVIII., 226, 227; belief in, contributed to Communion in one kind, 245
Trent, Council of, decrees of, first authoritative formula other than Creeds in Roman Church, 1; estimation of Apocrypha by, 52; attempted to reform Indulgences, 153; speaks cautiously on invocation of Saints, 160; recognised Seven Sacraments, 184; character of work of, 333
Quotations from Canons and Decrees of:
On Scripture and tradition, 48 *n.* 1, 138; extent of Original Sin, 72; concupiscence not sin, 76; condition of man's will since the Fall, 80; Justification, 85; good works in themselves meritorious, 89, 90; works done before grace, 96; sinlessness of B. V. M., 103; possibility of falling from grace, 107; Predestination, 121; necessity of right belief, 123; distinction between temporal and eternal punishment of sin, 147 *n.* 1; Purgatory, 148 and *n.* 1; Indulgences, 153; honour paid to images, 154 and *n.* 1; veneration of relics, 157; invocation of Saints, 160; Mass to be said in Latin, 170; efficacy of Sacraments "*ex opere operato*," 176; Sacraments confer grace, 183; Seven Sacraments recognised, 184; Sacrament of Penance, 192 *n.* 1; remarriage of divorced persons forbidden, 196 *n.* 1; Extreme Unction, 197; "intention" required in those administering Sacraments, 203; Transubstantiation, 225; language on Presence in Eucharist compared with Black Rubric, 230; reception the purpose of institution of Eucharist, 235; Communion in both kinds not necessary, its advisability referred to Pope, 247, 248; Sacrifice of the Mass, 262; Private Masses, 262, 263; celibacy of clergy, 267, 268; Excommunication, 276, 277; form of Ordination, 295 *n.* 1
Trinity, doctrine of the, 27, 28
Tritheism excluded by Art. I., 27
Trullan Council allowed clerical marriage, 266

U

Unction, Eastern name for Confirmation, 184
—— of the Sick, a Primitive practice retained in Eastern Church, 196; and in Edward's 1st Prayer-Book, 197; discontinued in England since 1552, 198
Uniformity, Act of (1549), refers to Primitive Church as standard, 170
——, Act of (1552), refers to Primitive Church as standard, 171; testifies to character of Prayer-Book revision, 261
Unitarianism excluded by Art. I., 28
Universalism condemned in XLII. Arts., 321
Urban II. (Pope) granted Indulgence to Crusaders, 152
Ursinus joint-compiler of Catechesis Heidelbergensis, 333
Ussher (Abp. Armagh) required subscription to Arts. of 1615, 334

V

Variata Confessio, character of, 331; *quoted* on Justification, 85; approximates to Calvinistic doctrine on Eucharist, 235
Verceil, Council at, condemned opponents of Corporal Presence, 225
Vigilius of Tapsus may have composed Athanasian Creed, 64
Vincentius of Lerins may have composed Athanasian Creed, 64
Virgin, the Blessed, called Theotokos, 32 and *n.* 1; opinions on immaculate conception of, 97 *nn.* 3, 4; sinlessness

of, excluded by Art. XV., 102, 103; doctrine of immaculate conception of, 103; mentioned with due veneration in Homilies, 104; images of, restored in English churches, 155; Roman manner of invoking, 159 *n.* 1, 161
Visitation of the Sick, Office for, private Confession enjoined in, 191; Unction provided for, in 1549, 197
Vows, condemned in Augsburg Conf., 6, 7; obligation of, upheld by VI. Art. Law, 7; considered supererogatory, 99; Luther's attitude with regard to, 268

W

War not necessarily unlawful, 312, 313; held so by Anabaptists, 315
Westminster Assembly, attempted revision of XXXIX. Arts., 16 *n.* 2; made significant change in Art. II., 34, 35; and in Art. VI., 51; and in Art. IX., 72, 74; and in Art. XI., 86; treatment of Eucharistic Office by, 260 *n.*; drew up Confession, 335; text of Arts. I.–XV. as revised by, 343–348
—— Confession, history of, 335
Quotations from:
Atonement efficacious for the elect, 35 *n.*; ground of authority of Scripture, 51; binding force of moral law, 56; nature of Original Sin, 72; result of Original Sin, 74; sinfulness of concupiscence, 76; condition of man's will since the Fall, 80; works of supererogation condemned, 100; irresistible grace, 108; moving cause of Predestination, 117; all the called are not elect, 118; the Church invisible, 129; authority of civil magistrate in Church, 142 *n.* 2; practices connected with Eucharist, 240; the Pope Antichrist 310
Whitaker, controversy of, with Baro, 16
Whitgift (Abp. Canterbury), with others, draws up Lambeth Arts., 16
Wicked not partakers of Christ in Eucharist, new Art. upon, in 1563, 14, 243
Wiclif, held validity of Sacraments affected by unworthiness of minister, 202; doctrines of, condemned at Blackfriars, 202 *n.* 2
Wilfrid of York, appeal of, to Pope, 301 *n.*
Will, condition of man's, since the Fall, 79
William I. exercised supremacy in Ecclesiastical causes, 301, 302
Withers, George, on state of religion in Henry VIII.'s reign, 9 *n.*; on Edward's 1st Prayer-Book, 9 *n.* 1; on Elizabeth's Prayer-Book, 13 *n.*; on lack of discipline, 276 *n.* 2; on transference of supremacy from Pope to King, 305 *n.*
Wittenburg, Concord of, 330
Wolfgang Musculus on Cranmer's opinions, 342
Word, significance of the title as applied to the Son of God, 31
——, preaching of the, a Note of Church, 130
Works. *See Good Works*
—— before grace not pleasing to God, 95, 96
Worship, of the Host, 237; due to Christ present in the Sacrament, 238; in times of persecution, 282
Wretchlessness, meaning of, 118 and *n.*
Wurtemburg Confession, source of clause in Art. II., 29; of Art. V., 44; of clause in Art. VI., 47, 49, 50; of part of Art. X., 78; of part of Art. XI., 83; of Art. XII., 88; contains no Art. on Predestination, 112; source of part of Art. XX., 134; admits two Sacraments only, 185; history of, 331
Quotations from:—
On Justification, 83; good works, 88; works of supererogation, 100; authority of Church, 134; authority of General Councils, 141; invocation of Saints, 162; language to be used in congregation, 171, 172; Confirmation, 188, 189; private Confession retained, 193; Unction of sick condemned, 198; Infant Baptism, 216; objection to Transubstantiation stated, 226 *n.* 2; Real Presence, 232; practices connected with Eucharist, 239, 240; Eucharistic Sacrifice, 263; celibacy of clergy, 269, 270

Z

Zwingli, influence of teaching of, in reign of Edward VI., 50; abandoned Episcopacy, 168 *n.*; views of, as to nature of Sacraments, 179, 180; not always consistent, 180 *n.* 3; view of, on Eucharist expressed in XLII. Arts., 218; but opposed in XXXIX. Arts., 223; on import of the Eucharist, 223, 224, 227 *n.* 1; conference with Luther at Marburg, 232. *See also* '*Fidei Ratio*'

Printed by Ballantyne, Hanson, & Co., *Edinburgh and London*

Date Due

MR 17 49

DE 16 53

JUN 15 1974

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 01016 5373